



THE DEVIL AND KARL MARX

PAUL KENGOR

FOREWORD BY MICHAEL J. KNOWLES

THE DEVIL AND KARL MARX

THE DEVIL AND KARL MARX

**COMMUNISM'S LONG MARCH OF DEATH,
DECEPTION, AND INFILTRATION**

PAUL KENGOR, PHD

**TAN BOOKS
GASTONIA, NORTH CAROLINA**

The Devil and Karl Marx: Communism's Long March of Death, Deception, and Infiltration © 2020
Paul Kengor

All rights reserved. With the exception of short excerpts used in critical review, no part of this work may be reproduced, transmitted, or stored in any form whatsoever, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Unless otherwise noted, Scripture quotations are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible—Second Catholic Edition (Ignatius Edition), copyright © 2006 National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Cover design by Caroline Green

Cover image: Karl Marx by Alevtina_Vyacheslav/Shutterstock

Library of Congress Control Number: 2020936885

ISBN: 978-1-5051-1444-7

Published in the United States by

TAN Books

PO Box 269

Gastonia, NC 28053

www.TANBooks.com

Printed in the United States of America

Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them. ... For we are not contending against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this present darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places.

Ephesians 5:11; 6:12

*“Thus Heaven I’ve forfeited,
I know it full well.
My soul, once true to God,
Is chosen for Hell.”*

—Karl Marx, “The Pale Maiden,” 1837

*“Look now, my blood-dark sword shall stab
Unerringly within thy soul....
The hellish vapors rise and fill the brain,
Till I go mad and my heart is utterly changed.
See the sword—the Prince of Darkness sold it to me.
For he beats the time and gives the signs.
Ever more boldly I play the dance of death.”*

—Karl Marx, “The Player,” 1841

CONTENTS

Foreword

*Preface: “The Dance of Death,”
The Communist Killing Machine*

Part 1 The Specter

1 “A Specter Is Haunting Europe,”
The Unclean Spirit of Communism

Part 2 Karl Marx

2 “My Soul Is Chosen for Hell,” Marx’s Verse
3 “Governed by a Demon?” Marx’s Miseries
4 “Monster of Ten Thousand Devils,”
Engels Encounters Marx

Part 3 The Bolshevik War on Religion and the Church’s Resistance

5 “We Do Not Believe in God,” Lenin’s Necrophilia
6 “Satanic Scourge,”
The Church on Atheistic Communism

Part 4 Infiltration and Manipulation

7 “Liquidating Religious Beliefs,”
William Z. Foster and CPUSA
8 “Outstretched Hand,” Earl Browder’s Backhand
9 “Obliterating All Religion,”
Louis Budenz and Ben Gitlow Speak Out

- 10 “The Devil Doth Quote the Scripture,”
Manning Johnson on the Infiltration of the Church
- 11 “Over a Thousand Communist Men,”
Infiltration of Catholic Seminaries? Bella Dodd’s Claims
- 12 “They Kept a Tab,” Seminaries,
Churches, and Clergy Behind the Iron Curtain

- Part 5 They Are Legion
- 13 “The World’s Wickedest,”
Minions, Pagans, Weirdos, Radicals
- 14 “The Specter of the Frankfurt School,”
More Minions, Pagans, Weirdos, Radicals

- Part 6 Conclusion
- 15 “Fundamental Transformation,”
Marx’s Enduring Specter

Acknowledgments

Endnotes

Index

FOREWORD

Ronald Reagan described a communist as one who reads Karl Marx and an anti-communist as one who understands Karl Marx. Pithy and true, at least at the time, but conservatives in the decades since Reagan won the Cold War have begun to forget just what makes Marxism so wrong, and their failure to articulate Marx's fatal flaw has left an entire generation prey to the deadliest ideology in history, imperiling not only minds but also souls.

The majority of young Americans today hold a favorable view of socialism, according to a 2018 Gallup poll. Socialism is on the rise more than three decades after conservatives thought it had died in the rubble of the Berlin Wall. In just the past few years, admitted socialists have won elected office throughout the country, from the local to the national level. They have succeeded because, while conservatives have blabbered themselves hoarse denouncing the economic effects of socialism, they have ignored the deeper spiritual questions that actually move men's souls. That is why this book could not be published at a more opportune time.

Karl Marx envisioned a merely material world in which religion is "the opium of the people" and nothing matters but matter. Rather than question this false vision—indeed, our ability to question anything at all dispels it—many conservatives have contented themselves to debate Marx on his own materialist terms. "Socialism destroys economies," they observe. Then, "Socialism distorts markets." And finally, "Socialism just doesn't work."

But whether or not a political system "works" depends on what it's working toward. Socialism strives to tear down traditional society. At that task, socialism has succeeded everywhere it has been tried, at least for a time. The problem with socialism isn't the inefficiency; it's the evil. Marx

did not set out to tinker with markets and redistribute some wealth. He sought to radically transform society by changing human nature. He hated religion because he opposed God, the author of human nature. He sided with Satan, as he confessed in letters and ghoulish poetry quoted in these pages. Ex-communists such as Arthur Koestler and Richard Wright came to call Marxism “the god that failed.” Karl Marx erred not through mere miscalculation but through sin and heresy.

Unfortunately, the same softening on Marxism that took place in the realm of politics infected the Church as well, at times through misunderstanding and at others through outright infiltration. The Church has condemned Marxism since the mid-nineteenth century. Yet in 2019 the leading Jesuit periodical in the United States published “The Catholic Case for Communism.” Around the same time, the Holy Father made common cause with communists, according to the left-wing Italian newspaper *La Repubblica*. “If anything,” Pope Francis reportedly told the paper’s founder Eugenio Scalfari, “it is the communists who think like Christians.” One wonders if Karl Marx could hear the Pope’s compliment amid the wailing and gnashing of teeth in Marx’s eternal abode.

Still, Pope Francis has refused to count himself among Marx’s followers. “Marxist ideology is wrong,” he affirmed flatly in 2013. Francis’s predecessors spoke even more forcefully against communism in years past. “Religious socialism, Christian socialism, are contradictory terms; no one can be at the same time a good Catholic and a true socialist,” declared Pope Pius XI, who considered socialism “irreconcilable with Christianity.” His predecessor Pope Leo XIII condemned socialists as “a wicked confederacy,” “a pest,” a plague,” “a hideous monster ... that threatens civil society with destruction,” and “an evil growth” that attempts to “steal the very Gospel itself with a view to deceive more easily the unwary.” Bl. Pope Pius IX, writing even before Marx, decried communism and socialism with the same vigor.

Communists read Marx, anti-communists understand Marx, and no one understands Marx better than Paul Kengor. His was the unhappy task of wading through such diabolically inspired drivel, and for that we owe him a debt of gratitude. Kengor knows, like few others writing today, that terms such as “collectivism” and “individualism” only take the debate so far. Quibbles over marginal tax rates have never inspired a soul, least of all Karl

Marx. Ultimately the fight comes down to spiritual warfare: good versus evil.

In his most famous Cold War speech, Ronald Reagan, quoting Winston Churchill, warned, “The destiny of man is not measured by material computations. When great forces are on the move in the world, we learn we’re spirits, not animals.” And spirits must choose a side.

Euphoria at the fall of the Berlin Wall made utopians of otherwise hard-nosed conservatives, who declared “the end of history as such,” ironically echoing the grandiose rhetoric and barmy theories of the ideologue they claimed to have defeated. But history did not end. If anything, it has begun to repeat itself, “first as tragedy, then as farce,” just as Marx predicted in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*. The Evil Empire collapsed, but evil spirits continue to prowl about the earth seeking the ruin of souls because we contend in the end not against flesh and blood but “against the spirits of wickedness in the high places,” which will endure until the end of the world. In the meantime, we must know our enemy. In *The Devil and Karl Marx*, Paul Kengor masterfully helps us to do so.

Michael Knowles
Los Angeles, CA

NOTES ON STYLE

Style guides differ on the usage of upper- or lowercase for the word “communist.” Some use exclusively uppercase (a bad choice). This book uses uppercase if describing a person who was a formal member of the Communist Party vs. lowercase for someone who was a communist ideologically but not a party member. The distinction is very important. Everyone throughout the history of the communist movement knows that an uppercase “Communist” is a major distinction from a lowercase “communist.” The vast majority of communists ideologically refused to go so far as to join the Communist Party and become uppercase “Communists” because doing so required them to take a formal sworn loyalty oath to Stalin’s USSR, to the Kremlin, to the Soviet Comintern, and to Communist Party USA. They were unwilling to do that. Those Communists who did swear the oath took a huge step beyond those communists who refused to take the leap. (Public education pioneer John Dewey, to cite just one example, objected to “Communism, official Communism, spelt with a capital letter.” He had been a lowercase communist.) Thus, regardless of what rigid style guidelines might demand, we must be careful to make this crucial distinction. Likewise, this book employs an uppercase *P* for “Communist Party” (and a lowercase *p* when “party” is alone).

PREFACE

“THE DANCE OF DEATH”

THE COMMUNIST KILLING MACHINE

The purpose of a preface is to briefly set the table for what is to follow. In a book on the evil that is communism, that is a tall order. The blood banquet that is communist ideology could not be sufficiently laid out in a vast hall of volumes let alone a mere preface. To adequately convey the array of victims of communism is humanly impossible. I will restrict these opening observations to a few pages sketching only generally “the dance of death” (to borrow from Marx’s strange poetry) orchestrated by the handmaidens of this killer ideology.

It is important to start with a presentation of the numbers—the estimated number of victims. They speak for themselves—that is, for communism. Any ideology with a trail of rot like this is not of God but of the forces against God. It is not of God’s creation but a fallen angel’s anti-creation. It is not of the light but of the dark.

No other political ideology has produced as much wretched poverty, rank repression, and sheer violence. In country after country, implemented in varying forms across wide-ranging nationalities, traditions, backgrounds, faiths, and ethnicities, communism coldly and consistently violated the full sweep of most basic human rights, from property to press, from speech to assembly, from conscience to religion. So restrictive was communism in the twentieth century that its implementers routinely refused to allow citizens the right to exit (that is, escape) the destructive systems imposed within

their borders. In some cases, they erected walls to herd and fence in the “masses” they claimed to champion.

That bears repeating: so restrictive was communism that its advocates had to build walls—poured with cement, topped with barbed wire, patrolled 24/7 by secret police with automatic weapons turned on their own citizenry—to keep their people from fleeing. The ultimate symbols of that repression were the Berlin Wall and the frozen people-zoo that was the Soviet Gulag. Even then, those are just two symbols of the repression. We could point to so many more: the killing fields of Cambodia, Romania’s Pitesti prison, the NKVD’s Lubyanka basement, Fidel’s and Che’s La Cabana execution house, and modern concentration camps such as North Korea’s Camp 22 or China’s Laogai. Where to start, where to end?

Communism’s most successful form of redistribution was not wealth, which the ridiculous system fails to produce, but government-orchestrated crime. Everything was so nationalized and so centralized that it was as if the government seized crime too. And really, there were few more proficient political gangsters than communist leaders. Al Capone looks like Mister Rogers compared to a Pol Pot or Nicolai Ceausescu. It is no exaggeration to say that a Jeffrey Dahmer or Jack the Ripper could not begin to compare to a Felix Zherzhinsky or serial rapist Lavrenti Beria in sheer scale of victims. Not even close.

Communism committed a “multitude of crimes not only against individual human beings but also against world civilization and national cultures,” wrote Stephane Courtois, editor of the classic Harvard University Press work *The Black Book of Communism*. “Communist regimes turned mass crime into a full-blown system of government.”¹

In both theoretical and practical form, communism deprives individuals of their unalienable rights. It is a totalitarian, atheistic ideology. Communism’s chief form of redistribution is repression, crime, and murder. Under communism, there was no profession of self-evident, inherent “unalienable” rights—that is, absolute rights endowed by the Creator to humans to begin with, and thus protected by a just government. Governments were not “instituted among men” to help secure such rights, as Thomas Jefferson put it. No, communist governments took away those rights, depriving them, robbing them, absconding with them, in the name of a totalitarian system that, at some point, promised to usher in utopia.

“Communist regimes did not just commit criminal acts,” observed Martin Malia, a Harvard PhD and professor at the University of California-Berkeley, noting that there have been non-communist states that likewise committed criminal acts, “but they were criminal enterprises in their very essence: on principle, so to speak, they all ruled lawlessly, by violence, and without regard for human life.”²

The communist culture of death has been prolific. Whether by bullet, by starvation, by exposure to the elements, by war and terror against internal citizens and “enemies” of the state, or by whatever means. How many victims? Truly only God knows.

In 1999, *The Black Book of Communism* endeavored to attempt the impossible task of tabulating a Marxist-Leninist death toll in the twentieth century. It came up with a figure approaching 100 million.³ Here is the breakdown:

- USSR: 20 million deaths
- China: 65 million deaths
- Vietnam: 1 million deaths
- North Korea: 2 million deaths
- Cambodia: 2 million deaths
- Eastern Europe: 1 million deaths
- Latin America: 150,000 deaths
- Africa: 1.7 million deaths
- Afghanistan: 1.5 million deaths
- The international communist movement and Communist parties not in power: about 10,000 deaths

The Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation, the preeminent US-based center for detailing communist crimes, cites the figure of 100 million deaths.⁴ Numerous others agree and could be listed here. Dr. Malia aptly noted that the communist record offers the “most colossal case of political carnage in history.”⁵

And even then, here is something still more shocking: These frightening numbers are quite conservative.

Take the figure relating to the Soviet Union, where the *Black Book* recorded *merely* 20 million dead.⁶ Alexander Yakovlev, a high-level Soviet

official who became one of Mikhail Gorbachev's chief reformers, and who, in the 1990s, was given the official task of trying to add up the victims, estimates that Stalin alone "annihilated ... sixty to seventy million people." His figures are consistent with those long estimated by the likes of Nobel dissident Alexander Solzhenitsyn, among others.⁷

Most accounts of the overall Soviet death toll (Stalin plus other leaders) exceed 33 million, some twice that. Cold War historian Dr. Lee Edwards, citing the epic work on "democide" by political scientist R. J. Rummel,⁸ as well as the research of Solzhenitsyn, of the great Soviet scholar Robert Conquest, and of still others, estimates that Soviet governments were responsible for the death of 61.9 million of their own from 1917 to 1987.⁹ And yet, the Bolsheviks would be matched if not outdone by China's Mao Zedong, who, by numerous estimates, was responsible for the deaths of at least 60 million in China, and more likely over 70 million, according to the latest biographical-historical research.¹⁰ And then there were the killing fields of North Korea, Cambodia, Cuba, Ethiopia, Eastern Europe, Africa, and more. Among them, North Korea's pile of body bags unquestionably stack higher than the two million listed in the *Black Book's* bullet points.¹¹

Really, the death generated by communist governments in the twentieth century, and, primarily, in a more concentrated period from roughly 1917 to 1979, is surely closer to 140 million.

This would equate to a rate of multiple thousands dead per day over the course of a century. Even Adolph Hitler got nowhere close to that. In fact, neither did the two deadliest wars in history, World Wars I and II, which need to be combined and doubled to get near communism's butcher's bill. The highest estimates of the death produced during the entirety of the Spanish Inquisition (a period of some sixty years) come nowhere near the level of death in Stalin's military purge or even Lenin's first year in power.¹²

Anonymous wise-guys randomly surfacing and disappearing on the internet (many of them Millennials born after the fall of the Berlin Wall) emerge to dispute or nit-pick these numbers. Fine. Go for it, guys. Again, truly only God knows the real number. The devil might know too. Besides, the devil is in the details.

This much we do know beyond dispute: this was and remains a lethal ideology of boundless destruction and stupidity. One needs to think of

viruses, bacteria, plagues, disease, to approximate this level of man-made death. Even then, a malicious modern virus such as COVID-19, which placed a world on lockdown in the year 2020, comes nowhere close to communism's fatality rate. "Mankind has survived all manner of evil diseases and plagues," said Ronald Reagan, "but can it survive Communism?" Reagan called communism a "vicious" "disease." For good measure, he added that "Communism is neither an economic or a political system—it is a form of insanity."¹³

What sort of warped idea could unleash such agony? Conventional explanations simply do not suffice. The fullest answer resides in the realm of the spirit, a spiritual explanation. The dogged, hell-bent pursuit by many of such a perverse ideology—immediately evident as idiotic and unworkable from a cursory skim of the *Communist Manifesto*—is an utter mystery not explainable by mere rational understanding. This was and is, flatly, a diabolical ideology, with an inexplicable attraction to its adherents. It possesses a bizarre seductive quality to its ideological cultists.

And yet—and yet—those same cult-like adherents denounce religion as the "opiate of the masses." They have denounced it with a passionate hatred.

This book deals with the grim, disturbing, militant atheism and intense anti-religious elements of Marx and other founders and practitioners of communism. It is not a full-blown biography of Karl Marx, though it is partly a spiritual biography of the man (covered at length in parts 1 and 2).¹⁴ It contains many pages on his views on religion and, even, his words on the devil. This book tackles Marx spiritually but ultimately goes well beyond that to the wider matter of his communism and its various manifestations. This book might be better called *The Devil and Communism*; still, the literal manifesto began with Marx (and Engels), and Marx had things to say about the devil—things not pretty. The book starts with Marx, with the other communist disciples following. Many of these men were messing with some nasty stuff. This was not a routine atheism.

For the record, I will state upfront that I have not encountered nor do I present evidence of Karl Marx, say, conducting seances or engaging in black Masses or Satanic rituals, even as other writers on Marx have speculated on that stark possibility.¹⁵ Regardless, there was a fanatically deep hatred of religion and flirtation with the dark side that is undeniable

and chilling, especially in Marx's poetry. It also gives pause, as we shall see in these pages, to repeatedly encounter in the life of Marx family members and close friends referring to him with words like "governed by a demon" (his father), "my dear devil" (his son),¹⁶ "monster of ten thousand devils" (Engels), "wicked knave" (his wife), or the striking number of intimates and associates who did not hesitate to compare him to *Faust* or Mephistopheles, or use words like "possessed" to describe his demeanor, and on and on. One friend, journalist Karl Heinzen, was not unique among contemporaries and biographers who observed or recorded Marx shouting or "chanting the words from *Faust*," and described him as "mocking," trying to take under a "spell," and possessing eyes "like a wet goblin." To be sure, this is very much a short list, and some of these were likely in jest or expressed with a weird playfulness, though that is not always entirely clear.¹⁷ The frequency of such observations of and by Marx really is quite bracing and far too frequent to shrug off. Readers will see that there are way too many of these to blithely ignore. And no figure that I have ever studied or pursued in a biography was described in language like this.¹⁸ I am sure that every biographer reading this now (other than those of Marx) will nod in agreement.

"There were times when Marx seemed to be possessed by demons," recorded Robert Payne in his chapter "The Demons," in his groundbreaking, seminal 1968 biography of Marx. A prolific academic biographer of Marx, and a respected scholar and academic not expected to level such a shocking charge lightly, Payne asserted of Marx, "He had the devil's view of the world, and the devil's malignity. Sometimes he seemed to know that he was accomplishing works of evil."¹⁹

How evil? Well, I certainly have no proof that Karl Marx was a Satanist, nor can I confirm whether he was possessed. I would not dare hazard such a charge. I can affirm that he was an atheist. That is easy. No one denies that. Marx did not deny that. Some will say that an atheist would not be a Satanist because of an atheist's non-belief in the supernatural. More likely, what some mean to say or would like to say about Marx is that he was an atheist doing the work of the devil, whether he was fully cognizant of it or not. Some would be more inclined to say that Marx was possessed rather than a Satanist, as Payne even speculates. Perhaps. Again, these are things I cannot venture to attempt to authenticate.

And again, what is undeniable is the evil associated with and wrought by Marxist-communist ideology. It is a malignant track record that could only please the denizens of a darker world.

Most sentient human beings have at least a flickering notion of the immense suffering caused by communist ideology in the aftermath of Marx's *Communist Manifesto* penned two centuries ago. Far too many people, however, separate Marx the man from the evils ushered in by Marxism. That is a grave mistake. Not only are the results of Marxism very much the result of Marx's ideas and his very pen, but Marx himself penned some downright devilish things. Karl Marx wrote not only about the hell that was communism but about hell itself. In some such cases, Marx portrayed himself as chosen for hell, or chose hell for himself; in still other cases, he, in the role of the master of hell, consigned others to it.

"Thus Heaven I've forfeited, I know it full well," wrote Marx in an 1837 poem, one of many explored at length in the pages ahead. "My soul, once true to God, is chosen for Hell." That certainly seemed the perverse destiny for Marx's ideology. That statement also seems at least partly autobiographical, given that Marx, once a believer, once a Christian, had once been true to God. In another poem, Marx wrote, "The hellish vapors rise and fill the brain, Till I go mad and my heart is utterly changed. See the sword—the Prince of Darkness sold it to me." Here, too, seems an ironic metaphor for the bloody sword of communist ideology, surely favored if not wielded by the Prince of Darkness. And it, too, seems partly autobiographical, given how Marx's own heart had been utterly changed.

Alas, this book offers a close, careful look at the genuinely hellacious side of the ideology of Marx, of Engels, of Lenin, of Stalin, of Mao, of Pol Pot, of Fidel Castro—of communism. In part, it is a tragic portrait of a man but, still more broadly so, an ideology, a chilling retrospective on an unclean spirit that should have never been let out of its pit.

We see here in this book a long march of destruction, deceit, manipulation, and infiltration. It does not stop with Karl Marx, who was only the beginning. It merely starts with Marx. He was the launching point for an assault on religion that eventually included a penetration of churches worldwide and possibly even seminaries, including within the Catholic Church, and most certainly within Protestant denominations. That infiltration had terrible success in communist countries, of course, but its

tentacles also reached into free nations, including the United States of America.

“You may be interested in knowing that we have preachers, preachers active in churches, who are members of the Communist Party,” candidly admitted Earl Browder, general secretary of Communist Party USA, to students at Union Theological Seminary on February 15, 1935.²⁰ He and his party initiated an aggressive push to create a “united front” led by communists and socialists attracting a broader coalition of liberals and fellow travelers. The goal was to expand the party’s support, its membership base, and above all its agenda, which was always an agenda that saw religion as a menace. Nonetheless, communists and socialists would happily accept the support of the gullible religious left, knowing that they had many sympathizers in the mainline Protestant churches in particular, especially among certain clergy. Browder boasted that he and his comrades “could recite a thousand local examples of the successful application of the united front tactic, initiated by the Communist Party,” looking for “new recruits” to spread this united front “throughout the country and among all strata of the population.”²¹

This included recruitment among the religious and flat-out infiltration of churches. Communists would even seek out Catholics—their hardest nut to crack because of the intense, institutionalized, vehemently anti-communist counterforce of the universal Roman Catholic Church anchored at the Vatican. Browder warmly albeit deceptively offered, “We extend the hand of fellowship to our Catholic brothers.”

One of Browder’s erstwhile buddies, ex-communist J. B. Matthews, who had spearheaded the “united front” strategy, noted that, consistent with the party’s and Moscow’s and Lenin’s “communist code of ethics,” religion was to be exploited for advancement of the revolution, even if that involved blatant deception. “It is not surprising to find the Communist Party in the United States engaged in a systematic effort to lure the churches,” averred Matthews, “especially the Catholic Church, into the net of the party’s united fronts.” And though Matthews here singled out the Catholic Church, the communist efforts were far more vigorous and successful in Protestant churches. The Catholic Church was protected and preserved by leadership in Rome and savvy clergy at home, from the likes of Popes Pius XI and Pius XII to Fulton Sheen and Cardinal Spellman, among so many others. But that does not mean that all was kept pure and untouched and unscathed.

The smoke of Satan, to borrow from Pope Paul VI, did manage to seep under cathedral doors. Nonetheless, whatever the level of infiltration, Catholics and Protestants alike were in communist crosshairs, as were Jews, Muslims, Buddhists, and so many other believers. Communists sowed the seeds deep and wide, and the harvest was harsh, with bitter fruits that would grow throughout the remainder of the twentieth century, and continue today. Many of today's naively self-described socialists and "democratic socialists" have no idea of the rancid roots of this poisoned tree.

Drawing on documents that have been archived or shelved for decades, some of them being published or quoted at length here for the first time, what is included in this book will shock readers but also alert them to a destructive force not merely historical and ideological but spiritual and diabolical. Remarks like these from Browder and Matthews and Marx are just the tip of the Siberian iceberg. Many such alarming words will be shared here from Soviet Comintern archives, from Communist Party USA documents, from sworn testimony by ex-communist leaders, from a disquieting assortment of minions and pagans and weirdos and radicals, and still more.

Readers no doubt will be taken aback by the devil in the details.

PART 1

THE SPECTER

CHAPTER 1

“A SPECTER IS HAUNTING EUROPE”

THE UNCLEAN SPIRIT OF COMMUNISM

The opening lines of the *Communist Manifesto* could not have been more eerily apt: “A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of communism,” wrote Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in 1848. “All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this specter: Pope and Tsar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies.”

Marx and Engels opted for such words: a specter, a *haunting* specter—a specter haunting Europe. Marx and Engels further opted for the word “exorcise”—the process for expunging a demon. Jesus Christ expelled demons. The Roman Catholic Church has long had a Rite of Exorcism for ridding people of demonic infestation. The very first image chosen by Marx and Engels to describe their ideology in the opening line of their book seems quite telling if not chilling. Whether it was serious or sarcastic, perhaps tongue in cheek (Marx had a mordant sense of humor), it was nonetheless fitting, and prophetic. They were on to something, or something was on to them and their ideology. If ever a force could be described as a haunting specter in dire need of exorcism, the phantom unleashed by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels fit the bill.

The two could not have conjured up a better description of what would play out in the course of history.

Marx and Engels correctly noted that all the powers of Europe were allied against this phantom or, that is, had “entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre.” They named great statesmen like Klemens Von Metternich as well as authorities such as German police-spies (who actually had Marx under surveillance). They singled out the pope. They pointed to the Russian czar, one of which three decades earlier had called for a Holy Alliance at the Congress of Vienna. Scarcely could Czar Alexander have foreseen the infernal beast that would devour his beloved Russia a century later. The pope of the day, Pius IX, actually had foreseen it.

And why wouldn’t the powers of Europe desire a holy alliance against this specter? They all recognized that an unholy spirit dwelled within their midst. Here in this chapter, we will take our first look at the contours of that specter and of the man who summoned it.

Communist Catechism

Marx and Engels viewed the initial draft of their manifesto as a revolutionary “catechism” for an awaiting world. More than that, they saw it and referred to it, certainly in the initial draft stage, as a literal *Communist Confession of Faith*, before opting for the title that stuck. “Think over the Confession of Faith a bit,” Engels wrote to Marx in November 1847. “I believe we had better drop the catechism form and call the thing: *Communist Manifesto*.”²²

Even then, the document was, for these proud atheists, very much a catechetical confession of faith for communists. Their communism became their religion, even as they scoffed at religion as something for superstitious idiots. Truly, their manifesto was and became their catechism—their bible.

At a more material level, one might better accuse communists of fashioning a golden calf than channeling an unclean spirit. What communists effectively bowed down to was just that: a material idol forged and focused on money, property, gold. It was not about the soul. The key to the communist-Marxist utopia would be economics. Solve the economic problem, the communists believed, and you would solve the human problem.

Why such an economic goal was ever perceived by any group as the pinnacle of human development is a darned good question. To most people, economics and class simply are not that monumentally important. Sure, a

roof over one's head and food and financial security are obviously important, especially for those lacking basic necessities; no one denies that. Still, for most individuals, economics is not the centerpiece of existence. To communists and many socialists, however, this is the alpha and omega. They speak as if man truly does live by bread alone; if society resolves, say, "economic inequality," levels all incomes to the same dollar number, or more fully redistributes wealth, then something closer to heaven on earth can follow. As Pope Benedict XVI said, the fatal flaw of communists and socialists is that they had their anthropology wrong. They did not adequately understand man. As Augustine said, we all have a *God-shaped* vacuum that God alone can fill; not a dollar-signed vacuum. We crave the divine manna of heaven.

Atheist communists and socialists have always mistakenly felt that the answers to man's miseries are found not in God (the existence of which they deny) but in economic materialism. It is so ironic that communists and socialists blast the wealthy for being allegedly obsessed with money and material things when, in fact, communists and socialists are obsessed with money and material things. But as most rich people learn, money does not buy happiness. Humans desire more than that. How profound that Jesus told Satan that man does not live on bread alone. As the two debated, the Living Bread told the tempter that man lives by every word from the mouth of God. Marx took not the side of Christ on that one. Of course, Marx rejected Christ in total. Communists are atheists after all.

Communists are also, curiously, utopians—*secular* utopians. They sought a heaven on earth—for them, an earth without religion. They did so without realizing that utopia is not only elusive but such a literal self-contradiction that it does not exist. The Greek roots of the word are *ou topos*, or "no place." In other words, there is no utopia, at least not in this world and realm. And yet, communists would pursue this *no place* with religious-like zeal.

In his classic *Private Property and Communism* (1844), Marx grandiosely exclaimed that "Communism is the riddle of history solved, and it knows itself to be this solution."²³ Few ideologies, or ideologues, have been so boastful. In his *German Ideology* (1845), Marx fantasized, "In communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing

today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, herdsman or critic.”²⁴

That is a picture of utopia. And the *Manifesto* was a utopian treatise.

Marx and Engels published their *Communist Manifesto* in 1848 as the official programmatic statement of the Communist Party (or Communist League) outlining exactly what communists believed and planned to pursue. That is what the *Communist Manifesto* really was—namely, a manifesto for the party which, at that point, had lacked a single written statement laying out communist beliefs.

Notably, usage of the word “communism” preceded the *Communist Manifesto*, as Marx and Engels were able to refer to it in the book as something that already existed (though not by long) and was known to certain people. It is possible that they coined the term themselves in Paris a few years before the publication of their *Manifesto*, but pinning that down is elusive; they certainly, however, popularized the term. Quite fittingly, Marx and Engels met in August 1844 in the left-wing looney bin that was and is Paris, where Marx a year earlier had already moved with his wife and begun studying the French Revolution and various utopian socialists, while attending workers’ meetings and engaging in other fanciful leftist functions.²⁵

Marx envisioned an apocalyptic revolution leading to the overthrow of capitalism by the impoverished working class, the common people, the masses—the so-called “proletariat.” The stage in the revolutionary process immediately following this overthrow would be that of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. That “dictatorship” would be a waystation on the road to the ultimate utopian goal of a “classless society.” The state, in the process, would be abolished; it would die out; it would “wither away.” With a classless society, class antagonisms would hence disappear, as would conflict (including armed conflict), as would economic inequality, as would social inequality, and peace and harmony would follow. Society would evolve through dialectical stages: from feudalism to capitalism to socialism to communism.

Note that final transition: from socialism to communism. When asked to define the difference between socialism and communism, Marion Smith, director of the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation, likes to say

that Christians go to heaven, whereas socialists go to communism. That is indeed the transitionary process, and Smith's language is apt, given that the communist views full communism as a sort of New Jerusalem. The atheistic communist, whether realizing it or not, subscribes or aspires to a messianic vision.

Moreover, Marx and Engels insisted, this wondrous socialism would need to sweep the planet in order to work. It had to be worldwide. That was the plan, and that is no small thing. Nonetheless, Marx and Engels, and then Lenin and Stalin and a train of others still to this day, felt it could happen. It was the ultimate utopian pipedream.

And yet, the plan was not so dreamy as to lack any specificity. To the contrary, Marx and Engel had a ten-point plan. Here it is, taken verbatim from their manifesto:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of all property of emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal obligation of all to work....
9. ... gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools.

Marx and Engels demanded that such a ten-point program be implemented not merely in one nation but throughout all nations of the world. Many subsequent socialists, beginning with Vladimir Lenin and his Bolsheviks in 1917, worked from that blueprint.

Of course, Marx and Lenin and the boys knew that terror would be necessary to implement such a truly radical, totalitarian ideology. After all, their philosophy demanded an unequivocal rejection of most basic rights, including property. Stated Marx, “The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.”

Many Marxists and socialists and “democratic socialists” today fuss over the extent to which Marx wanted to remove or limit property, but in the *Manifesto*, he (and Engels) doubled down. “You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property,” they wrote. “But in your existing society, private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population.” And then this: “In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend.”

That is truly radical, revolutionary. It constitutes nothing less than a fundamental transformation of human nature.

The rejection of such a natural if not sacred right violates the most basic precepts of all peoples, from the cave to the courthouse, from Judeo-Christian thinking to the most innate urges of primitive tribes. God’s commandment *Thou shalt not steal* implies a right to property. Marx was not oblivious to just how radical his vision was. He himself acknowledged that his views stood undeniably contrary to the “social and political order of things.” Communism, he and Engels wrote in their *Manifesto*, not only seeks to “abolish the present state of things” but represents “the most radical rupture in traditional relations.” They knew what they were advocating; this was a revolution, touching on everything from property to the family. “Abolition of the family!” they wrote with an exclamation. “Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the communists.”²⁶

Again, look at just a few of the specific policy recommendations in the ten-point plan of the *Manifesto*, which included “abolition of property in land” (point 1), “a heavy progressive or graduated income tax” (point 2), “abolition of all right of inheritance” (point 3), “centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly” (point 5), “centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state” (point 6), and a breathtaking call for “gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of the population over the

country” (point 9). Chew that one over: Marx and Engels and friends wanted to distribute not only your property but you yourself.

If that is not a ready-made recipe for coercion and despotism, then what is?

Indeed, Marx and Engels willingly conceded that this program would require despotism. They stated of their ten points, “Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads.”

Of course, it cannot. Human beings would not give up such fundamental liberties without resistance. Seizing property alone would require a terrible fight, prompting implementers to use their guns and gulags. This is a vision that necessitates prison camps.

Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and a long line of implementers candidly admitted that force and violence would be necessary. In the close of the *Manifesto*, Marx said, “The Communists ... openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the *forcible overthrow* of all existing social conditions” (italics added).

How could it not? How could this not lead to bloodshed, even terror? It would, and with no excuses before, during, or after.

“We have no compassion and we ask no compassion from you,” Marx wrote in May 1849. “When our turn comes, we shall not make excuses for the terror.” Marx added, “There is only one way in which the murderous death agonies of the old society and the bloody birth throes of the new society can be shortened, simplified and concentrated, and that way is revolutionary terror.”²⁷

He stated emphatically that “Socialism cannot be brought into existence without revolution.”²⁸

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, the French socialist, prophetically saw where Marx and his ideas would lead. He viewed Marx as intellectually merciless, pitiless, as the “exterminator” who was perfectly prepared to let Europe drown in blood if such was what was required for his cherished theories to be vindicated. And true to his personality, Marx would denounce Proudhon as an idiot worthy of towering disdain and of being crushed.²⁹

Again, violence would be necessary.

To borrow from Leon Trotsky, communist revolutionaries would not arrive at the kingdom of socialism on a polished floor with white gloves.

Blood would need to be spilled. The blood of innocents would consecrate the communist ground.

Vladimir Lenin saw his Bolsheviks as “glorious” Jacobins—the sick, depraved killers who guillotined some forty thousand people in France in one year in the late eighteenth century. He compared his Bolshevik faction of his Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party to Jacobins, or, as Soviet Comintern head Grigori Zinoviev put it, “the most glorious of the Jacobins of the time of the Great French Revolution.”³⁰ Lenin loved the Jacobins. He praised the “great, ineradicable, unforgettable things provided by the Jacobins in the eighteenth century,” and claimed that “the Jacobins gave France the best models of a democratic revolution.”³¹

Lenin, too, knew implicitly that violence would be necessary. “The truth,” explained Lenin, a moral relativist who saw himself as supreme gatekeeper of Marxist doctrine, “is that no revolution can be successful unless the resistance of the exploiters is crushed.” A few months later, in November 1918, Lenin warned that “Anglo-French and American imperialism will inevitably strangle the independence and freedom of Russia unless world-wide socialist revolution, unless world-wide Bolshevism, conquers.”³²

As this suggests, Lenin also simultaneously expressed a favorable view of war. “To reject war in principle is un-Marxist,” he wrote in July 1914, knowing full well that Marx himself said the same. Averred Lenin, “Who objectively stands to gain from the slogan ‘Peace?’ In any case, not the revolutionary proletariat.” He reaffirmed this one year later, in July 1915: “We cannot support the slogan ‘Peace’ since it is a totally muddled one and a hindrance to the revolutionary struggle.”³³

I will have much more to say about Lenin and the Bolsheviks later. For now, it should be clearly understood early on that they, in the spirit of Marx, would not make any excuses for the terror they would pursue as they harnessed the specter of communism.

Marx and Hegel

Sticking with communism’s launch at this stage in this book, it is helpful to understand Marx’s view of the so-called “dialectic” of history, which he took up at the University of Berlin as a student. This was the philosophy of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, which taught that history is a series of

struggles between opposing forces, with each successive struggle unfolding on a progressively higher plane than the one that preceded it. Ultimately, according to Hegel, human history is a dialectical unfolding of the truth—that is, “Truth” itself. Hegel was a Christian.³⁴ As one Hegel scholar wrote, this “dialectical unfolding ends in the revelation of God.”³⁵ Marx himself even referred to Hegel as “a theologian.”³⁶

Hegel envisioned a different plane for the struggle than Marx did—one based on ideas. Hegel’s was an “ideational dialectic.” Marx’s plane was not one based on the battle of ideas—the so-called “ideational plane” of Hegel—but one based on economics and classes and materialism. It was a dialectical materialism.

Though Hegel deeply impacted Marx, unpacking Hegel is not easy. While doing so fully is beyond the scope of this book, it should be noted that there have long existed “Right-Hegelians” and “Left-Hegelians,” especially in the German-speaking world. The Hegelians on the right, in the day, defended the Prussian monarchy, Lutheran Christianity, and private property, whereas the Hegelians on the left defended *democracy*, atheism, and socialism.³⁷ As noted by Grant Havers, philosophy professor at Trinity Western University, the Left-Hegelians have certainly been more successful in defining, if not appropriating, Hegel’s name and legacy, to the point that Hegel today is seen by most as a man of the left. His most famous appropriators included Marx, Ludwig Feuerbach, and Bruno Bauer.³⁸

Havers notes that Hegel “declares that religion is for all human beings.” Or, as another source put it, for Hegel, religion, together with philosophy, was the “highest form” of a person’s spiritual life.³⁹ The “conservative Hegel,” some scholars believe, “insists on the necessity of Christianity because he rejects any ‘End of History’ narrative that makes religion unnecessary.” Some Hegel scholars believe that Hegel’s interpretation of the resurrection of Jesus Christ on the final day is the actual conclusion of the march and movement of history that Hegel expected.⁴⁰ Such, of course, would constitute the complete opposite of the Marxist view, which removes Christ entirely from the dialectic of history. The Marxist utopia ends not with a Christian Second Coming but a secular, atheistic classless society, a workers’ paradise.

By the 1840s, many of these Young Hegelians had become vocal atheists.⁴¹ One of them was Karl Marx, as was his buddy Bruno Bauer.

Marx and Bruno Bauer and Friends

The leading member of this group of Berlin Hegelians was Dr. Bruno Bauer, who had a profound influence on Marx.⁴² Marx biographer Jonathan Sperber probably puts it best when he describes the thuggish intellectual Bauer as an “unsavory character,” the farthest left and “most radical” of the Young Hegelians, an “open atheist,” an anti-Semite, a “nasty individual,” and “arrogant and self-centered to boot.” And he was Marx’s pal, even roommate, during a crucial formative period for Marx in his early twenties. Sperber is spot on when he records that contemporaries saw Marx as Bauer’s protégé.⁴³

Bauer became a professor of theology at the University of Bonn, where he specialized more in the finer points of atheism than theology.⁴⁴ His field of specialty was New Testament criticism, which he embraced with vigor. His treatise, *Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels*, denied the historicity of Christ and portrayed the Gospels as fantasy, as mythical inventions.⁴⁵

Bauer started lecturing at the university in 1834. The radical theologian became Marx’s closest friend once Marx got to the University of Bonn.⁴⁶ They met during the summer of 1837, when Marx had just turned nineteen years old. Marx became a frequent visitor to the home of Bruno and his brother Edgar. One of only two courses that Marx took at the University of Bonn after abandoning his legal studies was a course that Bauer did on the Hebrew prophet Isaiah.⁴⁷

A buddy of Bauer and Marx was another German theological jester, Ludwig Feuerbach, who in 1841 let loose his magnum opus of heresy, *The Essence of Christianity*. “Then came Feuerbach’s *Essence of Christianity*,” gushed Engels. “With one blow it pulverized the contradiction, in that without circumlocutions it placed materialism on the throne again. ... The spell was broken; the ‘system’ was exploded and cast aside, and the contradiction, shown to exist only in our imagination, was dissolved. One must oneself have experienced the liberating effect of this book to get an idea of it. Enthusiasm was general; we all became at once Feuerbachians.”⁴⁸

Here from Feuerbach was another arrogant tome on how man created God rather than vice versa.

One of Marx's close contemporaries, Arnold Ruge, wrote to a friend that Bauer, Feuerbach, Marx, and another associate were forming a dubious band "making atheism their slogan. God, religion, and immortality are cast down from their thrones and man is proclaimed God." Georg Jung, still another contemporary, wrote to Ruge, "If Marx, Bruno Bauer and Feuerbach come together to found a theological-philosophical review, God would do well to surround Himself with all His angels and indulge in self-pity, for these three will certainly drive Him out of His heaven."⁴⁹

Precisely that was in store. In March 1841, Bruno Bauer was planning to start a philosophical journal called *Archives of Atheism*. He planned to do so with no less than the young Karl Marx as co-editor. It never got off the ground because it lacked funding from a wealthy capitalist or two. Apparently, a rich atheist socialist willing to share the wealth was not found. The bitter Bauer moaned that what he really yearned to do "as a professor" was "to preach the system of atheism publicly." Shortly, the professor of Protestant theology was fired from his lectureship in March 1842, thus eagerly framing himself a martyr to the atheist cause.⁵⁰

But Bauer and Marx had more antics up their atheist sleeves. As a parting shot in anger over his dismissal, Bauer enlisted Marx in what biographer Jonathan Sperber called a "public, atheist provocation." For that Easter season 1842, Bruno and Karl went to the nearby village of Godesberg, which was a favorite excursion site from Bonn, rented donkeys, and rode them through the village in what was a direct and deliberate parodying of the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem. The incident, says Sperber, would be spread by word of mouth in and around Bonn, and would be recalled fondly by Bauer in the years ahead.⁵¹

No doubt parodying, if not mocking, Christ's entrance into Jerusalem was considered by Karl and pals a hilarious secular hosanna. Their supporters to this day surely get a good chuckle out of the display. It was probably the kind of thing that admiring Marx biographer Francis Wheen had in mind when he wrote with a smile, "In July 1841 Marx went to stay with Bruno Bauer in Bonn, where the two reprobates spent an uproarious summer shocking the local bourgeoisie—getting drunk, laughing in church, galloping through the city streets on donkeys."⁵²

What a couple of cards!

Of course, laughing in church and mocking Christ were private gestures by Marx seen only by small gatherings. What Karl really wanted to let rip were some anti-religious screeds for the ages, ultimately to be seen by millions.

Francis Wheen also finds oddly amusing and endearing another perverse episode in Marx's behavior at this time—from another associate who ran in these circles. The journalist Karl Heinzen, a friend of Marx, helped walk Marx home “after several bottles of wine.” Heinzen recounted, “As soon as I was in the house, he shut the doors, hid the key and jeered comically at me that I was his prisoner. He asked me to follow him up into his study.” The smashed Marx soon forgot that Heinzen was there, but then he came around and began acting very strangely—nay, impishly, with intended devilry. Literally so. Heinzen recorded:

He came over to me, gave me to understand that he had me in his power, and, with a malice that recalled an imp rather than the intended devil, he began to attack me with threats and cuffs. I begged him to spare me that sort of thing, because it went against the grain to pay him back in the same coin. When he did not stop I gave him a serious warning that I would deal with him in a way which he would certainly feel and when that too did no good I saw myself compelled to dispatch him into the corner of the room. When he got up I said that I found his personality boring and asked him to open the front door. Now it was his turn to be triumphant. “Go home then, strong man,” he mocked, and added a most comical smirk. It was as though he was chanting the words from Faust, “There is one imprisoned inside ...” At least, the sentiment was similar, although his unsuccessful imitation of Mephistopheles made the situation comic in the extreme. In the end I warned him that if he would not open the door for me, then I would get it open myself and he would have to pay for the damage. Since he only answered with mocking sneers, I went down, tore the front door off its lock and called out to him from the street that he should shut the house up to prevent the entry of thieves. Dumb with amazement that I had escaped from his spell, he leaned out of the window and goggled at me with his small eyes like a wet goblin.⁵³

Marx biographer Francis Wheen strangely describes this episode as “attractive,” reflective of the jolly Karl's “taste for revelry and rough-housing.” Heinzen clearly did not perceive it that way, nor likely would most others.

As we shall see, this is but one written account from someone who knew Marx and witnessed such disturbing behavior. Heinzen used words like “imp,” “intended devil,” “Faust,” “Mephistopheles,” “chanting the words from Faust, ‘There is one imprisoned inside ...,’” “in his power,” “mocking sneers,” “dumb with amazement that I had escaped from his spell,” “small eyes like a wet goblin.” (Quite eerily, we shall see that this

smacks of Karl Marx's description of the devilish behavior of his character "Oulanem" in his dramatic poem by the same.)

Are we supposed to laugh this off? Shrug it off as *playful*, as *delightfully roguish*? What are we supposed to think when we encounter fiendish (*er, goblinish*) behavior like this from Marx?

This is nothing to laugh at.

There is a coda to the Heinzen story, a sequel that Wheen concedes "is all too predictable." Marx, a mean and vindictive man, years later lashed out at Heinzen as a "loutish philistine," an "untrustworthy egoist."⁵⁴ Marx's obsequious puppy Engels jumped in, piling on for Karl, barking that Heinzen was "the most stupid person of the century" (quite a statement coming from the two persons with the most stupid ideas of the century). As for Heinzen, who by this point in late 1860 had immigrated to America, he fired back, describing Marx as a mix between a cat and an ape, a liar with a yellow dirty complexion, and, among other things, a man of small eyes possessed by "a spirit of wicked fire."⁵⁵

No doubt that last description was in keeping with the small-eyed wet goblin whose gaze and spell Heinzen had encountered years before. All common traits of the hovering specter of communism and its keeper.

Marx and Bakunin

Another atheist ally of Karl Marx was Mikhail ("Michael") Bakunin (1814–76), a Russian atheist and revolutionary socialist-anarchist, and every bit the wild man. The two would later split, but they first met in Paris in the early 1840s and hit it off.

"We saw each other often," wrote Bakunin, "for I greatly respected him for his learning and for his passionate and serious devotion to the cause of the proletariat. ... I eagerly sought his conversation." When he first met Marx, Bakunin said that Marx was "already an atheist, an instructed materialist, and a conscious socialist." Bakunin said that because of their temperaments, there was no "frank intimacy" among them.⁵⁶

They would later become adversaries, as was typical for Marx and just about everyone he eventually could not stand. Marx flung his usual vitriol at Bakunin, and Bakunin rightly denounced "Marx's habitual weapon, a heap of filth." Bile aside, the essence of Marx's intellectual departure from Bakunin was probably valid. Marx surely found it hard to reconcile how

one could be a socialist and an anarchist, given that socialism champions the state and anarchy undermines the state. And yet, there are crucial similarities between Marx wanting to ruthlessly criticize everything that exists and Bakunin likewise lashing out at all authority, whether the authority of God, the Church, the factory owner, the state, et cetera. Still, by the time of the First Internationale in the 1870s, decades after they first met, Marx was eviscerating Bakunin as a “buffoon.”⁵⁷

Nonetheless, Marx and Bakunin knew each other well. This is not the place to lay out all of Bakunin’s thinking, but it is worth taking a few paragraphs to look at some of the halting sections of his best-known work, *God and the State*, published in 1871. The sentiments there very much reflect Marx’s thinking about religion.⁵⁸

Bakunin began the book with a very Marxist sentiment: “Yes, the whole history of humanity, intellectual and moral, political and social, is but a reflection of its economic history.” Marx would applaud that totally, as he would Bakunin’s opiate-like caricature of religion. Maybe Bakunin’s worst and most well-known phrase about God and religion is this one from *God and the State*: “If God really existed, it would be necessary to abolish him.”

Yes, you heard that right: “If God really existed, it would be necessary to abolish him.”

Bakunin had a nasty, angry, cynical view of God and religion, stating that religion enslaves, debases, and corrupts, and that “all religions are cruel, all founded on blood.” Curiously, however, he was not so nasty, angry, and cynical toward Satan, who he hailed as “the eternal rebel, the first freethinker and the emancipator of worlds.” This glorious rebel view of Satan is not unusual among certain radical socialists; as we shall see later in this book, this was how Saul Alinsky framed Satan as well—namely, as the “very first radical ... who rebelled against the establishment.”⁵⁹

That larger passage in Bakunin’s *God and the State* is worth quoting at length for a fuller idea of where this anarchist-socialist friend of Marx stood. Read it carefully, sentence after sentence, and prepare to be shocked:

Yes, our first ancestors, our Adams and our Eves, were, if not gorillas, very near relatives of gorillas, omnivorous, intelligent and ferocious beasts, endowed in a higher degree than the animals of another species with two precious faculties—the power to think and the desire to rebel....

The Bible, which is a very interesting and here and there very profound book when considered as one of the oldest surviving manifestations of human wisdom and fancy,

expresses this truth very naively in its myth of original sin. Jehovah, who of all the good gods adored by men was certainly the most jealous, the most vain, the most ferocious, the most unjust, the most bloodthirsty, the most despotic, and the most hostile to human dignity and liberty—Jehovah had just created Adam and Eve, to satisfy we know not what caprice; no doubt to while away his time, which must weigh heavy on his hands in his eternal egoistic solitude, or that he might have some new slaves. He generously placed at their disposal the whole earth, with all its fruits and animals, and set but a single limit to this complete enjoyment. He expressly forbade them from touching the fruit of the tree of knowledge. He wished, therefore, that man, destitute of all understanding of himself, should remain an eternal beast, ever on all-fours before the eternal God, his creator and his master. But here steps in Satan, the eternal rebel, the first freethinker and the emancipator of worlds. He makes man ashamed of his bestial ignorance and obedience; he emancipates him, stamps upon his brow the seal of liberty and humanity, in urging him to disobey and eat of the fruit of knowledge.

Again, here we see Bakunin's *good* Satan, a "freethinker." Such was a high compliment in the late nineteenth century (and into the early twentieth century), as "freethinkers" were in vogue among the progressive left. This *commendable* Satan is the great emancipator. Bakunin continued, decrying the role of the great spoiler: God. He narrates, characterizing the "good God" as, well, not exactly so:

We know what followed. The good God, whose foresight, which is one of the divine faculties, should have warned him [Satan] of what would happen, flew into a terrible and ridiculous rage; he cursed Satan, man, and the world created by himself, striking himself so to speak in his own creation, as children do when they get angry; and, not content with smiting our ancestors themselves, he cursed them in all the generations to come, innocent of the crime committed by their forefathers. Our Catholic and Protestant theologians look upon that as very profound and very just, precisely because it is monstrously iniquitous and absurd. Then, remembering that he was not only a God of vengeance and wrath, but also a God of love, after having tormented the existence of a few milliards of poor human beings and condemned them to an eternal hell, he took pity on the rest, and, to save them and reconcile his eternal and divine love with his eternal and divine anger, always greedy for victims and blood, he sent into the world, as an expiatory victim, his only son, that he might be killed by men. That is called the mystery of the Redemption, the basis of all the Christian religions. Still, if the divine Savior had saved the human world! But no; in the paradise promised by Christ, as we know, such being the formal announcement, the elect will number very few. The rest, the immense majority of the generations present and to come, will burn eternally in hell. In the meantime, to console us, God, ever just, ever good, hands over the earth to the government of the Napoleon Thirds, of the William Firsts, of the Ferdinands of Austria, and of the Alexanders of all the Russias.

Such are the absurd tales that are told and the monstrous doctrines that are taught, in the full light of the nineteenth century, in all the public schools of Europe, at the express command of the government. They call this civilizing the people! Is it not plain that all these governments are systematic poisoners, interested stupefiers of the masses?

This lengthy, appalling passage from Mikhail Bakunin speaks for itself. It requires no commentary, other than to perhaps note that surely Karl Marx

grinned an impish grin as he read it. Actually, one more comment seems due: Bakunin better have hoped to all hope that he was right; otherwise, he was destined to face a mighty reckoning someday in the afterlife. That is, as he faced and dealt with (in his words) this most jealous, most vain, most ferocious, most unjust, most bloodthirsty, most despotic, most hostile to human dignity and liberty, eternally egoistic Jehovah.

From there, Bakunin's rant continued, with the anarchist-socialist-atheist revolutionary himself aware of his own ranting:

I have wandered from my subject, because anger gets hold of me whenever I think of the base and criminal means which they employ to keep the nations in perpetual slavery, undoubtedly that they may be the better able to fleece them. Of what consequence are the crimes of all the Tropmanns in the world compared with this crime of treason against humanity committed daily, in broad day, over the whole surface of the civilized world, by those who dare to call themselves the guardians and the fathers of the people? I return to the myth of original sin.

God admitted that Satan was right; he recognized that the devil did not deceive Adam and Eve in promising them knowledge and liberty as a reward for the act of disobedience which he had induced them to commit; for, immediately they had eaten of the forbidden fruit, God himself said (see Bible): "Behold, man is become as of the Gods, knowing both good and evil; prevent him, therefore, from eating of the fruit of eternal life, lest he become immortal like Ourselves."

Let us disregard now the fabulous portion of this myth and consider its true meaning, which is very clear. Man has emancipated himself; he has separated himself from animality and constituted himself a man; he has begun his distinctively human history and development by an act of disobedience and science—that is, by *rebellion* and by *thought*.

Bakunin's *opus* runs on like this with page after page of such prideful bilge. He asserted, "All religions, with their gods, their demigods, and their prophets, their messiahs and their saints, were created by the credulous fancy of men who had not attained the full development and full possession of their faculties." Thus, he insisted "the religious heaven is nothing but a mirage" created by man, "exalted by ignorance and faith." This is fully consistent with Karl Marx's view that "man makes religion."

Again, this was from one of Marx's early admirers. No doubt, Marx's admirers today in the academy will be quick to rush to his defense and remind us that he and Bakunin became foes, or at least Bakunin became a rival in Marx's eyes. Yes, that is correct, but Marx's disapproval of Bakunin was not for any religious reason or disagreement. As for the words of Bakunin quoted here, Marx would have surely extended a warm smile and generous appreciation. Few appreciated a good rant against religion quite like Karl Marx.

Karl's Opium

In thinking about Marx and religion, or Marx and Bakunin, or Marx and Bauer, or Marx and Hegel, one cannot ignore the smoke that pervaded the Marxist living room. Let us address it here at last.

The most infamous of Karl Marx's remarks on religion was his demeaning assessment that religion is the "opiate" or "opium" of the masses. Few, however, are familiar with the wider context of the assessment, the larger passage that is no less reassuring, and that, like much of Marx and his disciples' writings, becomes even more addled and infantile as one tries to unpack it. Here is the section in full, taken from a mind-grunt of Marx scribbled in December 1843– January 1844, four years before the publication of his and Engels's *Manifesto*:

Man makes religion, religion does not make man. Religion is, indeed, the self-consciousness and self-esteem of man who has either not yet won through to himself, or has already lost himself again. But man is no abstract being squatting outside the world. Man is the world of man—state, society. This state and this society produce religion, which is an inverted consciousness of the world, because they are an inverted world. Religion is the general theory of this world, its encyclopaedic compendium, its logic in popular form, its spiritual point d'honneur, its enthusiasm, its moral sanction, its solemn complement, and its universal basis of consolation and justification. It is the fantastic realization of the human essence since the human essence has not acquired any true reality. The struggle against religion is, therefore, indirectly the struggle against that world whose spiritual aroma is religion.

Religious suffering is, at one and the same time, the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people.

That in itself was negative enough by Marx, depressing enough, cold and heartless enough. As usual, however, Marx was far from finished venting the acrid recesses of his bitter brain:

The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is the demand for their real happiness. To call on them to give up their illusions about their condition is to call on them to give up a condition that requires illusions. The criticism of religion is, therefore, in embryo, the criticism of that vale of tears of which religion is the halo.

Criticism has plucked the imaginary flowers on the chain not in order that man shall continue to bear that chain without fantasy or consolation, but so that he shall throw off the chain and pluck the living flower. The criticism of religion disillusions man, so that he will think, act, and fashion his reality like a man who has discarded his illusions and regained his senses, so that he will move around himself as his own true Sun. Religion is only the illusory Sun which revolves around man as long as he does not revolve around himself.

It is, therefore, the task of history, once the other-world of truth has vanished, to establish the truth of this world. It is the immediate task of philosophy, which is in the service of history, to unmask self-estrangement in its unholy forms once the holy form of human self-

estrangement has been unmasked. Thus, the criticism of Heaven turns into the criticism of Earth, the criticism of religion into the criticism of law, and the criticism of theology into the criticism of politics.⁶⁰

That is a mouthful, and not worth wasting precious moments of our lives trying to decipher the entire passage in all its futility. But a few of the thoughts stand out and are worth underscoring because of their disastrous implications.

Note that Marx began with an emphasis on the “struggle” against religion, which was a rather negative way to frame humanity’s relationship with religion. This was a “struggle against religion” that he contended was merely man-made. Like Bakunin, Marx insisted that man badly needs emancipation. Religion is an artifice of man, he surmised, a creation not of God but of man. Man thus makes religion because he pathetically needs religion. This is a man who has already “lost himself” and thus requires “religion.” The state and society “produce religion,” which is a deformed, “inverted consciousness of the world.” This, the struggle against religion, is also a “struggle against that world whose spiritual aroma is religion.” This is why people crave religion as a kind of drug, or opiate, or “opium.” Marx coldly assessed, “Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people.”

That, to borrow from modern parlance (and with apologies to Marx), is the money line in the passage. Modern commentators are only familiar with the second sentence on the opium of the people. The preceding line, however, is equally revealing. It sets up the opium assertion. Look at both sentences again, in tandem: “Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people.”

That complete assessment by Marx is even more spiteful than the commonly abbreviated “opium of the people” snippet. It is damning. Religion is a “sigh” of an oppressed creature, of a heartless world, of soulless conditions. This is a despairing view.

Marx next used three crucial words he would also use in the *Communist Manifesto*: “abolition of religion.” Given what he had said in the previous line, he thus said (not surprisingly) that “the abolition of religion” is necessary for people to achieve “real happiness,” especially given that their *clinging* to religion (to borrow a description from Barack Obama, who in

2008 spoke sneeringly of Americans “clinging to their God”) is a mere “illusory happiness.” It was hence critical, said Marx, that the likes of him criticize religion because religion was the “halo” of a “vale of tears.” Here, of course, Marx opted for a striking religious metaphor, turning Christian imagery on its head, as he relished doing throughout his writing and throughout his life. (As Catholics know, the prayer “Hail, Holy Queen” includes the line “mourning and weeping in this valley of tears,” which some Catholics render as “vale of tears.”) For instance, Marx’s famous line, “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs,” is another bastardization of Christian language; in that case, Holy Scripture itself.⁶¹

Man, said Marx, must “throw off the chain” of “imaginary flowers.” He must discard “his illusions” and regain “his senses.” Why? Marx’s answer is pure nonsense—the sappy, self-defeating, self-contradictory moral relativism that has appealed to and ravaged the ruminations of the wider ideological left for centuries—“so that he will move around himself as his own true Sun. Religion is only the illusory Sun which revolves around man as long as he does not revolve around himself.”

This, of course, is relativistic pabulum. It is the sophistry that, unfortunately, has evolved into the modern secular-progressive *zeitgeist* that dominates America and the wider West today. It is the childish philosophical silliness that has enabled modern leftists to redefine everything from life to marriage to gender to sexuality to bathrooms.

When man makes himself his own Sun—that is, his own God—then he destroys his world. As ex-communist Whittaker Chambers observed, Marx and his minions were merely echoing the first mistake of man, initiated way back in the Garden of Eden: *ye shall be as gods*.

Note, too, Marx’s obsession with criticizing. The word “criticism” is used twenty-nine times in this essay, starting with the opening sentence: “For Germany, the *criticism of religion* has been essentially completed, and the criticism of religion is the prerequisite of all criticism.”⁶² This is another well-known and oft-quoted Marxist maxim, usually summed up as simply: “The criticism of religion is the beginning of all criticism.”⁶³

This was Marx’s mindset. It was around this same time, in an 1843 letter to Arnold Ruge, that Marx called for “the ruthless criticism of all that

exists.”⁶⁴ For Marx, criticizing religion would be at the beginning, the very foundation, of all criticism.

Marx finished his destructive passage with an exhortation to history, to philosophy, to law, to politics to undertake the secular righteous “task” to “establish the truth of this world.” What truth? That truth, alas, was Marx’s “truth.”

Ye shall be as gods.

Marx’s Brave New World

It is crucial to realize that communism, being a totalitarian ideology, endeavored to change human nature itself. This is clear throughout Marx’s writings. In *The German Ideology* (1845), Marx and Engels said that in order “for the widespread generation of this communist consciousness, and for the success of the cause, it is necessary that man himself should suffer a massive change.” This was a change, they said, that could only come through “a practical movement, a revolution.” There must be a literal process of “overthrowing” the old “filthy yoke and ... founding a new society only in a revolution.”⁶⁵

Human nature itself had to be changed. There had to be a fundamental transformation of human nature. A revolution of (or against, really) human nature.

In that framework, religion was viewed as a dangerous and ubiquitous rival belief system. It was Marxism’s chief competitor for the mind of the working class. The Soviet leadership would want Marxism and the state to be central to all citizens’ lives. Hence, the words of the *Communist Manifesto* were to be read and learned, drilled and memorized, internalized. Any challenging text, especially an influential one like the Bible, was unwelcome. Religion was perceived as an ever-present, powerful enemy, not to be taken lightly.

Marx was an atheist-utopian who envisioned a “new morality” without God. The path to utopia was a classless albeit godless society. The “classless society”—which would be a “workers’ paradise”—would, said Marx, make its “own history! It is a leap from slavery into freedom; from darkness into light.”⁶⁶

Marx promised nothing less than the creation of a “new world.” His “generation,” he portended, “resembles the Jews whom Moses led out of

the wilderness. It must not only conquer a new world; it must also perish in order to make room for the people who are fit for a new world.”⁶⁷ The old world and current generation must perish. It would be the communists who would play the role of sacrificial savior on behalf of a new covenant for the new world.

This kind of utopian idealism is common to the communist left and even much of the wider left, which otherwise proudly touts its cynicism and suspicion, especially of religious people. But when a centralized government looks to corral and herd the collective masses, the hardest left-wing pessimist can morph into the most hopeful idealist. Leftists scoff at the Baptist preacher clinging to his Bible or Catholic grandma clinging to her rosary, but damned if leftists are not equally as faithful when clinging to government as holding the path to salvation. The most doubting and brooding of communists have not been exempt from such full-faith secular idealism.

For that matter, just as Marx was not very impressed with Christians, he also was quite unimpressed with Christianity. And for those modern-day “social justice” Christians who like to invoke communism as somehow consistent with or reflective of Christian social teaching, well, Karl Marx begged to differ. “The social principles of Christianity preach cowardice, self-contempt, abasement, submission, humility,” scowled Marx. “The social principles of Christianity are hypocritical. ... So much for the social principles of Christianity.”⁶⁸

Not that Marx himself was any less self-absorbed than this alleged Christianity he condemned. “The more of himself that man gives to God,” Marx groaned, “the less he has left in himself.”⁶⁹ Marx was all about himself, answerable to himself alone.

Georg Jung, a Marx contemporary, a young lawyer, and a member of the Doctors’ Club, said that “Marx calls Christianity one of the most immoral religions.” Jung viewed Marx not as a political revolutionary but a theological-philosophical revolutionary who was attempting to overthrow the entire social system, not just an economic system.⁷⁰

The preceding tells us much about where Karl Marx ended up on the religion question. But where did he start? Was he always an atheist? And did his sojourn involve a detour or two along some highly troubled paths? When did his writings first reveal this ominous turn?

PART 2

KARL MARX

CHAPTER 2

“MY SOUL IS CHOSEN FOR HELL”

MARX’S VERSE

Marxism from the outset was a seriously perverse ideology that brooded in misery, wallowed in misery, advanced itself in the name of misery, and ultimately produced misery. It is no surprise that anyone who has studied its roots sees among them numerous pernicious ideas and influences.

Similarly, Marxism’s founder was a seriously perverse man who brooded in misery, wallowed in misery, advanced himself in the name of misery, and ultimately produced misery. It is no surprise that anyone who has paused to peer into *his* roots sees there numerous pernicious ideas and influences.

The reality is that one cannot separate Marxism the ideology from Marx the man. Aristotle observed, “Men start revolutionary changes for reasons connected with their private lives.”⁷¹ Karl Marx certainly seems one such case. The communist revolution he had in mind was in many ways the consummation of his unpleasant private life, as it was for many of his most revolutionary and deadly followers, particularly Vladimir Lenin, the other half of the Marxist-Leninist flame-thrower that set ablaze an awaiting century.

And when we cast a gaze into the fiery abyss of the life and mind of Karl Marx, we find some disturbing forces integral to understanding him

and what his ideology wrought. We have seen some of those thus far in the previous chapter, but here we will dig deeper, look more closely, to discover just what animated the person of Karl Marx.

How deep? How disturbing? How dark? Looking into the mind and man of Marx inevitably takes one to places where even angels fear to tread.

To that end, *Marx & Satan* is the unapologetic title of a decidedly politically incorrect look at the life of Karl Marx by the late Richard Wurmbrand, who spent fourteen years imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain for his opposition to atheistic communism.⁷² The Romanian pastor was brutally tortured—with what he described as a literal demonic zeal—so horribly, so unthinkably cruelly, with such diabolical imagination by his Marxist captors, that the good reverend can be forgiven for any hyperbole, and for sensing that the dark spirit of the devil himself seemed to be oozing out of his tormentors.

“All the biblical descriptions of hell and the pains of Dante’s *Inferno* are nothing in comparison with the tortures in Communist prisons,” stated Wurmbrand in his international bestseller *Tortured for Christ*. He recalled of his captors, “I have seen communists whose faces while torturing believers shone with rapturous joy. They cried out while torturing the Christians, ‘We are the devil!’” He remembered one torturer say, “I thank God in whom I don’t believe, that I have lived to this hour when I can express all the evil in my heart.”

Pause to look closely at those exclamations: “We are the devil!” “I thank God in whom I don’t believe, that I have lived to this hour when I can express all the evil in my heart.”

If anyone had a legitimate gripe suspecting a nexus between Lucifer and communism, the Rev. Wurmbrand did. He earned it. He experienced it. He witnessed it. And he traced seeds of it to the founder of Marxism.

Wurmbrand’s incendiary thesis that Karl Marx himself, let alone Marxism, owed some debt to the flames of the underworld is hard to coolly laugh off as the paranoid rantings of an embittered man. The fact is that some of Marx’s earliest and most passionate written works dealt with and dwelled in the netherworld. Karl Marx, in short, wrote about the devil.

“Hellish Vapors”

Marx's musings about the prince of darkness is a subject avoided like the seven plagues by his aficionados, particularly recent hagiographers. It is not something students can expect to hear from their progressive professor in their Socialism 101 class at Secular U, where all Marx is good Marx. Yet, those writings by Marx exist and are undeniable, even as the few sources who have dealt with them have tended to be largely (but not exclusively) historians on the anti-communist side. Some of these sources knew communism all too well; they lived under it. They include Yuri Maltsev, the economist who served in the Soviet government (in the central planning bureau), notably on the reform team of Mikhail Gorbachev, and today is a professor at Carthage College. Others who have dealt with this side of Marx include the bestselling popular British historian Paul Johnson, the prolific Christian historian Gary North, the free-market historian Mark Skousen, and the renowned Austrian School economist Murray Rothbard.⁷³ None of those are left-leaning sources. And yet, there have been academic scholars like Bruce Mazlish and Robert Payne who have addressed this aspect of Marx in books published by (among other houses) top university presses such as, respectively, Oxford University Press and New York University Press.⁷⁴ Payne did a deep dive into this sordid side of Marx, notably with a chapter titled "The Demons" in his impressive 1968 biography for Simon & Schuster, one among several biographies of Marx he wrote.

In all, then, Marx's sordid interest in that sordid world is not some unfounded and ungrounded assertion put out by some sloppy internet blogger in our current day. It has been clearly documented for many decades, even while ignored by so many on the political left.

Among these, arguably the best and foundational works which produced groundbreaking research into the subject were by Robert Payne, specifically his already mentioned 1968 work *Marx: A Biography* and his 1971 book *The Unknown Karl Marx*, published by New York University Press.⁷⁵ Payne, who was absolutely no right-winger, was a respected and thoughtful British professor of English literature and drama, a biographer, and a linguist—in addition to being an expert on Marx who studied and wrote about the man in great depth. Payne's translations of this shadowy side of Marx came from his reading of Marx's early poetry and theatrical dramas, which Richard Wurmbrand, Paul Johnson, and other authors would pick up, expand upon, and introduce to larger audiences in books published by top

trade houses such as (in Johnson's case) HarperCollins.⁷⁶ Payne's work, too, reached popular audiences (at least one of his Marx biographies), but some of his work was directed to scholars as an academic's compilation of various poetic and theatrical works of Marx.

As Payne correctly noted, Marx had a special love for poetry: "Marx was devoted to poetry. Poetry was in his blood, and he could no more think of living without poetry than living without his vision of a Communist world."⁷⁷

Marx most admired Goethe, from whom he could cite page after page by heart. (Not without irony, the later cultural Marxists that constituted the infamous Frankfurt School were hatched at Germany's Goethe University.) Payne stated of Marx, "He had a retentive memory and could recite long passages of Goethe's *Faust* with gusto, with a special preference for the speeches of Mephistopheles."⁷⁸

That is no casual thing: a special preference for Mephistopheles. He was especially fond of Mephistopheles's line from *Faust*: "Everything that exists deserves to perish."⁷⁹ This is no surprise; it reflects the very thinking of the man who in letters called for the "ruthless criticism of all that exists,"⁸⁰ who in the *Manifesto* declared that communism seeks to "abolish the present state of things," and who at the close of the *Manifesto* called for "the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

Marx also knew by heart passages from Dante's *The Divine Comedy*, though Marx clearly did not integrate Dante's worldview in the way that a typical Dante admirer would (like C. S. Lewis, for instance).⁸¹

Marx was no doubt drawn to the great Italian poet's imagery in *The Inferno*. It was a window into hell that Marx apparently yearned to open. Perhaps it is apt that Richard Wurmbrand thought of Dante's *Inferno* when his Marxist captors were tormenting him.

The Painful Significance of Marx's Poetry

Biographers who admire Marx and seek to cover for him will want to ignore his poetry among his corpus of writings. They should nonetheless bristle at what they see in Marx's poetry. They will encounter what Paul Johnson discerned: "Savagery is a characteristic note of his verse, together

with the intense pessimism of the human condition, hatred, a fascination with corruption and violence, suicide pacts and pacts with the devil.”⁸²

For a Marx hagiographer, this is reason to downplay or dismiss the poetry altogether. But to do so would be wrong and irresponsible.

As Robert Payne notes and documents—echoing what any careful reader of Marx can see in his letters and writings—Marx fancied himself a poet. He wanted to be a poet. It was a calling, a first love. He expressed that love for poetry in letters to his father and, more so, in love letters and poems to his beloved Jenny, the girl of his dreams who became his wife. But the poems were hardly restricted to love. Marx’s poems burned less often with love than with red-hot rage.

“The young Marx was passionately devoted to poetry,” wrote Payne, “and took himself very seriously as a poet. ... Poetry was the love of his life, the safe refuge from all the turmoils of his revolutionary existence.” Payne concedes that Marxist scholars have disregarded the poems as youthful indiscretions, not to be taken seriously and read apart from his more “mature” works. To the contrary, notes Payne, correctly, these poems are very closely related to his mature works, and he absolutely did not regard them as indiscretions.⁸³

Payne started his examination of the literary life of Marx with two plays that the young Karl wrote as a student. The first was called “The Player,” and was taken seriously enough to be published in the Berlin literary magazine *Athenaeum* in January 1841 when Marx was twenty-two years old—seven years before the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*. They were fittingly published by the editors under the title “Savage Songs,” which is precisely what they connote: pure savagery, and then some.⁸⁴

As for “The Player,” this unnerving poem describes a violinist who in a delirious frenzy summons up the powers of darkness with his furious strings. In this ballad, the violinist, who seems to be Marx himself, plays so frenetically that there can be only one outcome: he destroys himself. When an onlooker asks the violinist why he must perform this way—it is believed that the onlooker was Marx’s love interest and future wife, Jenny von Westphalen—a perturbed Marx answers that he cannot help himself and that he will stab her with his “blood-dark sword” before his violin and his heart burst.⁸⁵

Here is Marx:

The player strikes up on his violin,
His blond hair falling down.
He wears a sword at his side,
And a wide, wrinkled gown.

“O player, why playest thou so wild?
Why the savage look in thine eyes?
Why the leaping blood, the soaring waves?
Why tearest thou thy bow to shreds?”

Those are some stirring questions for this wild man, this savage with a bow, with leaping blood. And Marx answers for himself in the next lines, the answers of which resound within his soul in the depths of hell:

“I play for the sake of the thundering sea
Crashing against the walls of the cliffs,
That my eyes be blinded and my heart burst
And my soul resound in the depths of Hell.”

“O player, why tearest thou thy heart to shreds
In mockery? This art was given thee
By a shining God to elevate the mind
Into the swelling music of the starry dance.”

The player misuses this elegant art, the graceful sound of the violin. He uses it not to elevate the mind as God intended but for something quite the opposite. He denies God’s knowledge. He thinks not of bowing a heavenly chord but thrusting a blood-dark sword. And that is not all. Hellish vapors come too. They fill his brain. And the sword, it comes from the prince of darkness:

“Look now, my blood-dark sword shall stab
Unerringly within thy soul.
God neither knows nor honors art.
The hellish vapors rise and fill the brain,
Till I go mad and my heart is utterly changed.

See the sword—the Prince of Darkness sold it to me.
For he beats the time and gives the signs.
Ever more boldly I play the dance of death.

I must play darkly, I must play lightly,
Until my heart and my violin burst.”

The player strikes up on the violin,
His blond hair falling down.

He wears a sword at his side,
And a wide, wrinkled gown.⁸⁶

He plays not for God and to uplift the mind but for the “dance of death.” He plays it “darkly” until he and his violin both burst. Robert Payne interpreted the pact between Marx’s violinist—or, that is, Marx the violinist—and the prince of darkness as evocative of the pact between Goethe’s *Faust* and Mephistopheles.⁸⁷ It surely is just that. It is a Faustian bargain.

Among these passages in “The Player,” it is apropos that the founder of communism waxed poetic about “the hellish vapors [that] rise and fill the brain, Till I go mad and my heart is utterly changed. See this sword? The Prince of Darkness sold it to me. For me he beats the time and gives the signs. Ever more boldly I play the dance of death.”⁸⁸

Indeed, “*I play the dance of death.*” Marx here proved himself a better prophet than poet. The ideas for which he would be famous, the philosophy that he scripted, the international communist symphony for which he composed the score, represented less a play and a poem than a dance of death, a grand dance of death that left over one hundred million people dead in his name, in the ideology that bore his name—by bullet or sword, and perhaps sold by the prince of darkness, or at least in service to the prince of darkness.

Certainly some hellish vapors.

Those interpretations are mine. It is worth sharing the interpretation of Robert Payne—again, a Marx biographer with special expertise in literary criticism.

Payne describes the Marx ballad thusly: “A musician summons up the Prince of Darkness, a lover offers a poison cup to the beloved, and both run headlong to their deaths in a satanic rejection of the world.” Payne states that Marx succeeds in conveying “the terror at the heart of terror.” Marx, says Payne, “is not playing games,” as these poems not only “reek of fire and brimstone” but constitute “real fire and brimstone.” Payne observes that Marx “is here celebrating a satanic mystery, for the player is clearly Lucifer or Mephistopheles, and what he is playing with such frenzy is the music which accompanies the end of the world.”⁸⁹

More than that, adds Payne, we see in this poem a literal “pact with the devil,” one that is “consecrated by the purchase of the blood-dark sword, which kills with unerring aim.” The blood violinist is not destroying the world because he hates it, but is doing so in order to spite God, out of derision and mockery against the Creator. He is a rebel, like Satan, the ultimate rebel against God and Heaven. And Payne is absolutely justified in connecting this to the destructive Marx of the *Manifesto*, who seeks to destroy the world as it exists and fashion his own anew: “He was a man with a peculiar faculty for relishing disaster.”⁹⁰

Poisoned Cups and Flames of Hell

The second ballad of Marx that appeared in *Athenaeum* was no less distressing. Titled “Nocturnal Love,” the lovers end up once again consuming poisoned cups and consumed by the flames, which they sink into as disembodied spirits. Here again, we are assaulted with violence, grief, despair, pale maidens, doomed souls, and fire, fire, fire:

He pressed her violently to his heart
And gazed darkly in her eyes:
“Darling, thou art on fire with grief,
Thou tremblest beneath my breath.”

“Thou hast drunk of my soul!
Mine is thy glowing fire!
Shine, O my jewel,
Shine, shine, O blood of youth!”

“Darling, thou lookest so pale,
Thou speakest so strangely ever.
See how the heavenly choirs
Lift up the world to the skies!”

“Dear one, they are all lifted away!
The stars shine and shine!
Then let us fly away,
And our souls be mingled together!”⁹¹

And what is the destination of these souls mingled together and about to fly away? That is, the soul of he, the dark one, glowing with fire, and she, on fire with grief and trembling beneath his breath and pressed violently against his heart? That is, she, the blood of youth, yet pale, and he, of glowing fire, whose soul she has drunk from? To where are they flying? The answer, as usual with Marx, was terror and death, and flames, flames, flames—*roaring flames*! Marx continued:

So she spoke in gentle whispers
While the terror lay around,
And the light of roaring flames
Shone on her empty eyes.

“Darling, thou hast drunk of poison,
And now thou must depart with me.
Now the night has fallen,
There is no longer any day.”

He pressed her violently to his heart,
Death on her breath and breast.
She was pierced by deeper pain,
And her eyes were closed forever.⁹²

Once again, the object of Marx’s heart drinks of poison. She dies—death on her breath and breast, pierced by pain, eyes closed forever. They go to the flames. Another climax for Karl!

According to Robert Payne, the poem was evidently addressed to Marx's love, Jenny, who is the female permitted to speak in the second and fourth verses. "It is an ominous and deeply disturbing poem," concedes Payne, "for a man does not write such things unless he is on the verge of madness or despair."⁹³

Here we must pause for a crucial note of foreshadowing: It seems more than ironic that such despair, death, and suicide—specifically through drinking poison—will pervade the grim family life of Karl and Jenny. As we shall see, two of Marx's daughters killed themselves by drinking poison in suicide pacts.

Upon reading outbursts like this, one marvels at how any biographer of Marx could neglect these writings. Actually, the answer is simple: If the biographer favors or esteems Marx and Marxism, is committed to Marx and to defending Marx, and is taking pains to construct a positive profile, then he avoids these poems like a burning building of flames, flames, flames. That is exactly what Marx's hagiographers have done.

The precedent was set long ago, when Franz Mehring, the preeminent original biographer of Marx, first read these writings in horror and returned them to Marx's daughter, Laura, declaring they should remain unpublished in order to protect Marx's reputation. Laura passed them along to her nephew, Jean Longuet, and they soon vanished. They were eventually retrieved only by the due diligence of Marxist scholar David Ryazanov of the Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow. He understood their significance and had the intellectual integrity to track them down and preserve and seek to publish them.⁹⁴

As for Marx's devotees today, one wonders about their intellectual integrity in blithely ignoring these poems. Most surely do so by conveniently convincing themselves that the poems are unimportant and tell us nothing about Karl Marx. Youthful indiscretions, you see. At least Mehring acknowledged that the writings were ugly and, therefore, should be repressed. Marx's favorable biographers today surely lie to and delude themselves, easily manufacturing excuses to not discuss these writings.

And yet, there were many poems by Marx just like this—some even worse.

"Oulanem"

Still more unsettling is a piece by Marx that became one of the main focuses of Robert Payne's analysis and also of Richard Wurmbrand, Paul Johnson, and others for its sheer iniquitous nature.

The play was, quite remarkably—and quite diabolically—titled *Oulanem*, which Payne explained as an anagram for “Manuelo,” “Immanuel,” “Emmanuel,” or “God.” As Payne formulated it, “Manuelo=Immanuel=God.”⁹⁵

Wurmbrand was blunter. He identified the anagram as a directly Satanist anagram for the name “Emmanuel” (or “Manuelo”), which is the Hebrew biblical name for Jesus, meaning “God is with us.”⁹⁶ It is, stated Wurmbrand, a sacrilegious inversion of a holy name.

In Sacred Scripture, the Angel Gabriel says to the Virgin Mary that she shall bear a child, and his name shall be Emmanuel, or Jesus. He will be called great and “Son of the Most High.” That is the beloved Son of God, of the blessed Trinity. Those are the words of the New Testament. But these were not the words of Karl Marx in his anagram for Emmanuel—and for his “Oulanem.”

Wurmbrand published his observation in the 1980s, and Payne wrote about the play in his biographies in the 1960s and 1970s. If you search for the word “Oulanem” today (as I did too many times in writing this book), you will immediately encounter a Wikipedia reference to the play, *Oulanem*, directly attributed to Karl Marx alone. Wikipedia, not exactly a devil's den of right-wingers, described it as a “drama or poetic play written by Karl Marx ... during his years as a student.”⁹⁷ A simple Google search easily yields the full text of the play posted verbatim at the historically very reliable (and pro-Marxist) website www.marxists.org.⁹⁸ Such a search generates still more. [Warning: Beware that when you do an online search for the term “Oulanem,” your computer will immediately pull up repulsive images of satanic figures that reflexively leave the reader with a sickening unease.] “Oulanem” is also recognized today as an anagram for “Manuelo” by some musicians in the world of heavy-metal (actually “black metal”) rock n' roll, where it is seen as synonymous with the term “Anti-Christ.”⁹⁹

That is the source that young Marx was messing with. Worse, he was invoking it as a force to destroy others—many others. In that vein, Marx's message in *Oulanem*—which is more than a poem; it is, rather, a poetic tragedy, or drama—is much more destructive than the message in “The

Player.” As Payne observed, the violence in “The Player” is turned inward, as the violinist destroys only himself, whereas the violence in *Oulanem* is turned outward with the destruction of man—namely, the threatened destruction of all mankind by the character that is “Oulanem.” Still more disquieting was Marx’s personal role in that vision. Payne observes of this particular play: “We enter a world where all the characters are learned in the arts of destruction, caught in the coils of a secret rage for vengeance. Since we are never told why they are so determined to exact retribution on so massive a scale, we may assume that Marx was giving vent to his own destructive rages. *Oulanem* is a revenger’s tragedy.”¹⁰⁰

Act 1 of *Oulanem* takes the audience straight into a dialogue between two of Marx’s main characters, including the namesake “Oulanem,” described as a German traveler, and his trusty companion, “Lucindo,” with the action taking place in a mountain town in Italy. Oulanem and Lucindo find no room in the inn, perhaps akin to Mary and Joseph finding no room in the inn to give birth to Emmanuel.

And yet, Oulanem and Lucindo are no Mary and Joseph, even as they are somewhat of a couple (or almost). Both are male, with the young and handsome Lucindo apparently (states Payne) a homosexual love-interest of Oulanem, who seeks to corrupt the boy. With no room in the inn, they accept the invitation of an Italian man named “Pertini” to stay in his house. Pertini, too, seems to have a homosexual interest in the boy. (Payne observes that this is written by Marx with such considerable skill that “Marx evidently knew a good deal about corrupting boys, or else he had watched the process closely.”¹⁰¹)

As Marx himself stated in his play, “Oulanem, Oulanem. The name rings forth like a death, rings forth until it dies away in a wretched crawl.” He penned this disquieting passage:

Yet I have power within my youthful arms
To clench and crush you with tempestuous force,
While for us both the abyss yawns in darkness.
You will sink down and I shall follow laughing,
Whispering in your ears, “Descend,
come with me, friend.”

Each insidious scene crawls on like this, increasingly disconcerting and wrathful. Scene 3 is among the most bitter, where Oulanem is seated alone at a table, writing, with papers tossed all around (not unlike Marx himself, oddly enough, who was notorious for writing and working the same way). He suddenly springs up and stands with arms folded and declares:

All lost! The hour is now expired, and time
Stands still. This pigmy universe collapses.
Soon I shall clasp Eternity and howl
Humanity's giant curse into its ear.
Eternity! It is eternal pain,
Death inconceivable, immeasurable!
An evil artifice contrived to taunt us.

This is the climactic scene, where the time comes for the death of Oulanem. It is here that Marx, rather astoundingly, appears to have himself declare, in the person of his subject, the Creator (God presumably, or some other all-creating, all-powerful source): "I shall howl gigantic curses at mankind."

Shocking as this is, it is nonetheless reflective of a frightening penchant for violence and world destruction that permeated Marx's poetry, a sort of prelude to enunciating his destructive political-economic vision for the world.¹⁰² In a scene that repeatedly shouts "curses" and that "smashes" the world to pieces—"I will smash to pieces with my enduring curses"—Marx continued with the dreary and hopeless narrative. He summed up coldly:

The worlds, they see it and go rolling on
And howl the burial song of their own death.
And we, we Apes of a cold God, still cherish
With frenzied pain upon our loving breast
The viper so voluptuously warm,
That it as Universal Form rears up
And from its place on high grins down on us!
And in our ear, till loathing's all consumed,
The weary wave roars onward, ever onward!
Now quick, the die is cast, and all is ready;
Destroy what only poetry's lie contrived,

A curse shall finish what a curse conceived.

Note the grim morbidity: Apes of a *cold* God vs. the viper so *voluptuously warm*. Destruction. Lies. Curses. Curses. Curses.

A curse will finish what a curse had conceived.

Payne notes that Oulanem sees himself as the agent of destruction, as the judge who condemns and then acts as executioner, confident that he is in possession of the powers of God to annihilate the universe. Men, in that universe, are no more than apes of a cold God. Payne viewed this Marxist vision as directly transferrable to Marx's philosophical vision. He perceived the dialogue between Oulanem and the other characters as assuming the form of a classic Marxist "dialectical struggle" that is "never completely resolved, precisely akin to the Marxist ideological vision of the world."¹⁰³

Payne thus affirmed that the speech of Oulanem is important to understanding Marx's ideas: "Combat or death, bloody struggle or annihilation." He notes that in the *Communist Manifesto*, "we hear the same strident voice calling for a war to the death between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, a merciless battle with no quarter given by either side. It is important to observe that Marx's philosophy of the destruction of classes has its roots in romantic drama."

It seems still more important, in light of what Marxism actually produced, that after Marx's Oulanem continued to heap curses upon curses on a hopeless and miserable mankind, he sits down at the table, grabs his pen, and writes. As Payne observed, we are not told what Oulanem was writing, "but it may be a suicide note or a formal sentence of death on all creation."¹⁰⁴ In effect, that is the end result of what Marx himself wrote when he sat down to write his larger manifesto.

Alas, Payne discerned, "Oulanem was Marx as judge and executioner."¹⁰⁵ Indeed he was.

It is also telling that at the time of *Oulanem*, Karl Marx was aspiring to nothing less than write the *Faust* of his age. And to repeat, Marx loved the line pronounced by Mephistopheles in *Faust*: "Everything that exists deserves to perish." As Payne notes, Marx's drama *Oulanem* is an extended improvisation of that theme, a line that Marx himself used in other writings, quoting it with relish, for instance, in *The Eighteenth Brumaire*.¹⁰⁶

But even then, Marx's *Oulanem* is worse than Goethe's *Faust*. As Payne noted, Marx had effectively brought us the archetype of Oulanem before as the crazed violinist of "The Player" who accepted a sword from the prince of darkness, sawing on his violin in a mad frenzy to drive the world to destruction. "He is Mephistopheles," avers Payne, "but not the Mephistopheles of Goethe; he is an altogether lesser creature bereft of dignity, possessing only malice and the desire for vengeance." It is vengeance that dominates Marx's long soliloquy in which Oulanem exalts in his power to shatter the world through his curses, consigning the entire human race to damnation.¹⁰⁷

Richard Wurmbrand remarked that *Oulanem* may be the only drama in which every character is fully aware of his or her own corruption and yet all flaunt and celebrate it with prideful conviction. All of the characters are irredeemably bad. And this is not done by the playwright with a noble purpose of revealing the dark to herald the light. There is no light. There is no black and white here in Marx, just black. "Here all are servants of darkness," wrote Wurmbrand. "All are Satanic, corrupt, doomed."¹⁰⁸

Finally, and perhaps what is most significant and chilling, we must note how Marx himself saw his play. He pridefully viewed *Oulanem* as a personal poetic masterpiece, one in which he flatly nailed his objective. He wrote to his father in November 1837, "These last verses are the only ones in which it seemed to me that I had been struck by the magic wand."¹⁰⁹

Whose wand? Whoever wielded it, Marx wielded the pen, and it was in writing this grotesque drama that Karl felt he had been at his best.

Trembling in Terror and Horror

Perhaps *Oulanem* was not the "only drama" of Marx in which every character is depraved. To assume so would be to underestimate Karl Marx, who, after all, wrote many, many things, and was, after all, the founder of communism.

There were yet more troublesome Marx writings. Here is a likewise scary poem, titled "The Pale Maiden" (Payne does not deal with this one, which is posted at www.marxists.org),¹¹⁰ a self-described love "ballad" where Marx exclaimed:

The maiden stands so pale,

So silent, withdrawn,
Her sweet angelic soul
Is misery-torn.

Therein can shine no ray,
The waves tumble over;
There, love and pain both play,
Each cheating the other.

Gentle was she, demure,
Devoted to Heaven,
An image ever pure
The Graces had woven.

Then came a noble knight,
A grand charger he rode;
And in his eyes so bright
A sea of love flowed.

At this point in what could have become a lovely ballad, Marx's scenario characteristically turned morose. That is no surprise, given that Karl Marx was not one for happy endings:

Love smote deep in her breast,
But he galloped away,
For battle-triumph athirst;
Naught made him stay.

All peace of mind is flown,
The Heavens have sunk.
The heart, now sorrow's throne,
Is yearning-drunk.

And when the day is past,
She kneels on the floor,
Before the holy Christ

A-praying once more.

And nigh, here, yet again for Marx, the scene moved away from the holy Christ, from promise to hopelessness, to terror, to horror, to hell itself:

But then upon that form
Another encroaches,
To take her heart by storm,
‘Gainst her self reproaches.

“To me your love is given
For Time unending.
To show your soul to Heaven
Is merely pretending.”

She trembles in her terror
Icy and stark,
She rushes out in horror,
Into the dark.

She wrings her lily-white hands,
The tear-drops start.
“Thus fire the bosom brands
And longing, the heart.

“Thus Heaven I’ve forfeited,
I know it full well.
My soul, once true to God,
Is chosen for Hell.

He was so tall, alas,
Of stature divine.
His eyes so fathomless,
So noble, so fine.

“He never bestowed on me

His glances at all;
Lets me pine hopelessly
Till the end of the Soul.”

What had begun as a potential redeeming romantic ballad by Marx turned into a late-night, B-movie horror show, with the sickly pale and lily-white-hands and icy-and-stark maiden rushing out into the murky night, trembling in terror. Here again, the characters forfeit heaven in favor of choosing hell. It was typical Marx.

What to make of this? In fact, one is tempted to literally ask, what the *hell* to make of this? What was Karl Marx saying? What kind of freak-horror show was he offering?

Well, we can discern what he was saying; his bleak messages of despair are fairly evident. It isn't rocket science. But more pointedly, to the question of the poet-philosopher himself, what part was Marx himself playing in this and other poems? From which end of the abyss did he gaze? What was he advocating? Was Marx “chosen for Hell,” his soul no longer “true to God?” Was he pining hopelessly till the end of his soul? Or was he in the role of the devil choosing this gloomy fate for these forlorn, pale people?

Taken individually, the stanzas are not always clear, though the larger narrative of Marx's writings and life undeniably place him somewhere digging in the pit.

Wurmbrand went so far as to make the case that Marx himself was a Satanist, one who plunged “into the depths of Satanism.”¹¹¹ His soul was no longer true to God (Marx indeed had become a committed atheist by this point) but was now true to Lucifer. Admirers of Marx will surely want to dispute that, given their fealty to their beloved founding father, for whom they make excuses for everything. Nonetheless, there is no debating the man's misery and his shaking his fist at God. Those two attitudes reinforced one another in the Marxist project, whether poetical or political.

“There is no support for the view that Marx entertained lofty social ideals about helping mankind,” concluded Wurmbrand. “Marx hated any notion of God or gods. He determined to be the man who would kick out God.”¹¹²

Marx's poetry certainly seemed to do that. And Marx's disciples and implementers would certainly kick out God. The devil was in their details.

Historical Context

Modern Marxist oddballs will find reasons to defend this nightmarish trash—in a way, of course, they would never do if, say, a Republican president had penned such pernicious claptrap. They will want to say he was joking, having fun—thus begging the intriguing question of how, exactly, this is humorous or fun—maybe being ironic, perhaps role-playing of some curious sort. The problem with such assertions is that we cannot say any of that with certainty. At the same time, those who dislike or disdain Marx should not go dashing in the opposite direction and chalk this up as a telltale sign of, say, explicit devil worship—of Marx using the same pen to pull out a piece of paper to sign a contract selling his soul to Satan. There is likewise no evidence to assert that.

We should all, however, concede one reality beyond dispute: this is highly disconcerting.

Marx's progressive cheerleaders might also want to write this off as the innocent musings of youth. There are at least two big problems with that: First, typical youth do not write (and publish) verse like this. If Marx's pom-pom boys and girls would like to go that route, then I ask them directly here and now: Did all of you write garbage like this? I bet not. Second, however, is a bigger problem, namely, Karl was not exactly a kid when he scribbled this twaddle. He wrote "The Pale Maiden" in 1837, his nineteenth year of life. He wrote "The Player" in 1841, his twenty-third year. And if Marxists suddenly want to toss out that whole period of Marx for the convenience of ignoring such alarming writings, then they should shelve their recent hagiographic film universally hailed by all of them: "The Young Marx."

Do they want us to celebrate the young Karl or not? Embrace him or ignore him? Do we lionize the young Marx or not? Hero or goat? You ought to be willing to accept the bad with the good. This material, dear comrades, would fall into the bad category.

But more than that, one still cannot shrug off such poems from Marx by simply claiming they were mere youthful musings. After all, this period of 1837–41 (and beyond) is when Marx became Marx. These were his college years, his graduate work years, his dissertation period, the time that he left his Christian faith of his teen years, the period when he launched into his most prolific writing. The 1840s were the peak of his writing, culminating

in his writing the *Manifesto* in 1847. Modern Marx biographers coo over his “touching” letters to his father at this time.

If defenders of Marx want to try to make an eternity of the six years between 1841 and 1847, or of the ten between 1837 and 1847, well, we can make that messy for them as well. The timeline is not as long as they would prefer for their purposes of denial. It was the summer of 1837 that Marx first encountered the Young Hegelians, becoming a member of the Doctors’ Club. Again, the leading member of the group was Dr. Bruno Bauer, and it was that year, in March 1841, that he and Marx planned to launch their review journal *Archives of Atheism*, with Karl as co-editor. Think about that. Such would reveal the Marx of 1841—that is, the Marx of “The Player”—to be a rather aggressive atheist, and hence not an unlikely candidate to write something as unheavenly as “The Player.”

Those are just two examples. Here is a mere partial list of Marx writings and categories of writings from this period, again reflecting someone who was not exactly a kid who had written nothing but a few silly poems about Satan in his notebook. This is a cut and paste from the categories of various Marx writings posted at the Marxist clearinghouse, www.marxists.org:

| | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1837 | The Young Marx A Book of Verse Letters |
| 1838 | Letters |
| 1839 | Notebooks on Epicurean Philosophy Letters |
| 1840 | Letters |
| 1841 | Marx’s Doctoral Thesis Letters |
| 1842 | On Freedom of the Press Articles in <i>Rheinische Zeitung</i> (Marx and Engels) Letters |
| 1843 | Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right Letters |
| 1844 | Comment on James Mill Deutsche-Französischer Jahrbücher (Marx and |

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Engels) including Introduction to Critique of Philosophy of Right Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts On The Jewish Question Letters |
| 1845 | The Holy Family (Marx and Engels) Theses On Feuerbach The German Ideology (Marx and Engels) Letters |
| 1846 | Saint Max Letters |
| 1847 | The Poverty of Philosophy The Communist League Wage Labour & Capital Wages Articles in <i>Deutsche-Brüsseler Zeitung</i> (Marx and Engels) True Socialism The True Socialists Letters |

As any informed Marxist knows, listed here are just some of the numerous poems, letters, published articles, books, notebooks (on Epicurean philosophy), critiques of Hegel, and many long, serious writings—some of Marx’s most important and lasting—between 1837 and 1847. These include his 1841 doctoral thesis, titled *The Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature*. Again, that was published the same year as his 1841 poem, “The Player.” They include his autumn 1843 essay *On The Jewish Question*, his autumn 1843 screed *The Holy Family*, his 1843 “A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right” (where he wrote of religion as the “opium of the people”), his famous 1845–46 work *The German Ideology*, his 1847 book *The Poverty of Philosophy*, and much more.¹¹³ The *Communist Manifesto* immediately followed, published in 1848.

Above all, Marx met Engels during this time, in November 1842, and thereupon began plotting to change the course of history. This Karl Marx is

the Karl Marx of history. The man's heart was tormented, governed, as we have seen, by some sordid and disturbing things.

CHAPTER 3

“GOVERNED BY A DEMON?”

MARX’S MISERIES

“**A**nd since that heart is obviously animated and governed by a demon not granted to all men, is that demon heavenly or Faustian?”

So pondered a pensive, perturbed Heinrich Marx, Karl’s father, in a letter to his son written March 2, 1837. The heart in question was Karl’s. Heinrich was concerned about what was animating and governing his son’s heart. The full passage of the letter reads:

At times my heart delights in thinking of you and your future. And yet at times I cannot rid myself of ideas which arouse in me sad forebodings and fear when I am struck as if by lightning by the thought: is your heart in accord with your head, your talents? Has it room for the earthly but gentler sentiments which in this vale of sorrow are so essentially consoling for a man of feeling? And since that heart is obviously animated and governed by a demon not granted to all men, is that demon heavenly or Faustian? Will you ever—and that is not the least painful doubt of my heart—will you ever be capable of truly human, domestic happiness? Will—and this doubt has no less tortured me recently since I have come to love a certain person like my own child—will you ever be capable of imparting happiness to those immediately around you?¹¹⁴

It was at the same time a prophetically sad question, a concession, as well as a premonition by the father. Could Karl ever be happy? What was possessing his heart?

A good question. One that we today are still left pondering.

“Religion Lies at Our Feet”

Karl Marx was born on May 5, 1818, in the city of Trier, one of the loveliest, oldest, most tranquil, most peaceful, most religious, and most deeply Catholic cities in Germany (a population that was 90 percent Roman Catholic).¹¹⁵

It was hard to find a more Catholic place. The Christian roots of Trier are remarkable. None other than St. Ambrose, the future bishop of Milan who brought Augustine into the faith, was born in Trier in the year 340. The city boasts the oldest church in Germany, dating to AD 320–330. It is said that St. Helena (AD 246/248–330) herself gave a portion of the land to build the church there. She also gave Christians no less than Constantine, her son, the great Roman emperor and protector of Christians. Among the most sacred relics believed to be held at Trier’s grand cathedral is the Seamless Robe of Jesus, also known as the Holy Robe, or Holy Coat, which Christ wore on the way to his crucifixion—the one for which the Roman soldiers had cast lots. According to tradition, St. Helena obtained the robe in the Holy Land around AD 327 and brought it to Germany.

Such is the city of Trier. It is special, long beloved by Christians.

Not surprisingly, Karl Marx’s literary idol Goethe disapproved. “The place is burdened, nay oppressed, with churches and chapels and cloisters and colleges and buildings dedicated to chivalrous and religious orders,” grumbled Goethe upon a visit in 1793, the year the Jacobin guillotine was dropping incessantly upon necks in Catholic France, “and this is to say nothing about the abbacies, Carthusian convents and other institutions which invest and blockade it.”¹¹⁶

Only Goethe, and later Marx, could detest Trier.

Karl’s father and mother started their family there. Karl had such a world of promise and decency in front of him. Holiness was fully available at practically every corner.

Marx’s family was Jewish, on both his father’s and mother’s sides. They were not only ethnically Jewish but had a healthy family history of devout Judaism. There had been several rabbis in the recent family history, from the nineteenth century back to at least the late seventeenth century.¹¹⁷ “It would be difficult to find anyone who had a more Jewish ancestry than Karl Marx,” writes biographer David McLellan.¹¹⁸

Under the social pressures of the day, Marx’s father left Judaism and converted to Protestantism at some point in the late 1810s or early 1820s,

most likely at the end of 1819.¹¹⁹ It is particularly intriguing that Heinrich chose Protestantism over Catholicism, the latter being a much more common choice for Jews who left Judaism in Catholic Trier, including his brother Cerf. Marx biographer Jonathan Sperber explains that Heinrich was much more liberal, a product of the Enlightenment, who, tellingly, if not fatefully, had read Voltaire aloud to the young Karl.¹²⁰ He knew Voltaire and Rousseau by heart.¹²¹ With the sort of candor and disdainful language his son would use, Heinrich denounced what he called “the Gospels polluted by ignorant priests,” in favor of what Sperber described as “a liberal and Enlightened Protestantism, not entirely separate from Deism, that would be Heinrich Marx’s Christianity of choice.”¹²²

Heinrich became Lutheran. It was a choice that allowed him more choices to define his own views. The son would seize upon such choices with wild abandon.

Still, Heinrich at least saw value in believing in God. He advised Karl that “a good support for morality is a simple faith in God. You know that I am the last person to be a fanatic. But sooner or later a man has a real need of this faith, and there are moments in life when even the man who denies God is compelled against his will to pray to the Almighty.”¹²³

Heinrich’s wife, Henrietta, was much more reluctant to convert, and thus delayed not only her own conversion but the baptisms of her children as well. Karl was baptized not as an infant, which would have been just about the time that Heinrich converted, but in 1824, the sixth year of his life.¹²⁴

Karl, too, became Lutheran. He kept the faith—even if he was not always devout or clear or particularly orthodox—until probably his late teens and initial college years.¹²⁵ He definitely shed his faith during his college years and was unquestionably an atheist by the time he did his dissertation at age twenty-three in 1841. In his dissertation, he approvingly quoted the first century BC Roman philosopher Lucretius’s eulogy for Epicurus, condemning the “burden of oppressive religion,” which “with gruesome grotesqueness frightfully threatened mankind.” Lucretius exalts, “Religion lies at our feet, completely defeated.”¹²⁶

That was the triumph to which Karl Marx thereafter committed himself: religion at our feet. It was a shame, a waste of the richly religious soil he

had tread and was raised upon. He would stomp upon that religious bounty rather than feed upon it as nourishment for his troubled soul.

Marx, Luther, and the Reformation

Though this book is not the place to adequately treat the subject, it is noteworthy that Karl Marx seemed to appreciate Martin Luther's rebellion against the Church. In no way is that observation intended to equate Luther with Marx or his goals, and certainly not with the destruction produced by communism. For starters, Luther was, of course, anything but a godless atheist. Whereas Marx liked what Luther did, or, more specifically, liked the byproduct of what Luther did in terms of undermining the authority of the Church of Rome, Luther surely would not have liked what Marx did, nor the results of Marx's ideas or communism's madness.

Marx seems to have appreciated that Luther pulled away from the authority of the Church, which, for Marx, was a crucial step in the ongoing march of the dialectic of history—that is, of advancing and progressing to the next crucial stage in history, according to Marxist theory. He mightily approved of that step, even if he did not necessarily approve of Luther at a spiritual level. This is stated most emphatically by Marx in the long concluding section of his famous 1843 work “A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right.” It was there he described religion as “the opium of the people.” Interestingly, there he also credits Luther, who, he says, “overcame bondage,” specifically that bondage imposed by Rome. “On the eve of the Reformation,” Marx lamented, “official Germany was the most unconditional slave of Rome.” Just as Luther made a crucial break from the religion of Rome, now Marx and his fellow philosophers would make a crucial break in their revolutionary “emancipation.” Stated Marx, “As the revolution then began in the brain of the *monk*, so now it begins in the brain of the *philosopher*” (emphasis original).

Thus, for Marx, Luther had provided an indispensable service in clearing the path Marx envisioned for history.¹²⁷ What the monk began, the philosopher would conclude, although he would extend the path in directions of which Luther never dreamed, even in his worst nightmares.

In an 1854 piece that he wrote for the *New York Tribune*, approvingly titled “The Decay of Religious Authority,” Marx wrote that the “Protestant Reformation” allowed “the upper classes in every European nation” (here

again, Marx viewed nearly everything through the prism of class) to begin to “unfasten themselves individually from all religious belief, and become so-called free-thinkers.” That included statesmen, legalists, and diplomats. He noted that the Protestant Reformation had this effect not only among Catholic nations but even among those nations that adopted Protestantism. The Protestant Reformation that begat Protestantism allowed them all to think for themselves apart from the authority of the Church,¹²⁸ the Church founded by Christ. Again, this was a huge historical breakthrough, one which would serve Marx and the furtherance of his vision and ambitions.

Marx’s father liked that Lutheranism allowed him more latitude to think for himself. Karl, too, wanted full freedom for the widest “free-thinking.” Thinking completely apart from the Church of Rome could pave the way for him to open the door to philosophical communism. Breaking with Rome was the break he needed to pursue atheistic communism.

Notably, in that same article for the *New York Tribune*, Marx offered an insight into his view on the Crusades. The Crusades, greatly misunderstood and maligned to this day, were pursued by various popes, beginning with the First Crusade at the end of the eleventh century, as efforts to come to the defense of besieged Christians relentlessly attacked in Christian lands by Muslims in their holy war against “infidels.” Each Crusade had to meet the requirements of Just War theory. The goal was to rescue those Christians and recover land and sites (such as the Holy Sepulchre) that had been theirs until Muslim invaders seized them violently.¹²⁹ Karl Marx reversed this entirely, portraying the Crusades as the period “when Western Europe, as late as the eighteenth century, undertook a ‘holy war’ against the ‘infidel’ Turks for the possession of the Holy Sepulchre.”¹³⁰ This was a complete and outrageous reversal of which side had persecuted which. Of course, Marx’s misunderstanding of the Crusades is now the consensus of secular leftists today; what is worse, they are not the only ones who subscribe to that view.

Marx’s anti-Catholicism would show up in his writing. He wrote of one political associate, David Urquhart, who, “with his Catholicism, etc. grows more and more disgusting.”¹³¹ Curiously, as the *New York Tribune* piece suggests, he seemed to have a favorable opinion of Muslims. He praised certain Muslim Arabs, acknowledging a sympathy for their “hatred against Christians and the hope of an ultimate victory over these infidels.”¹³² Sure,

Muslims believed in God, and that, to Marx, was a bad thing, but at least they were against Christians. They had that redeeming quality.

Yet again viewing everything through class and economics, Marx criticized “the monetary system [as] essentially a Catholic institution,” and “the credit system [as] essentially Protestant.” He lamented that the credit system “does not emancipate itself from the basis of the monetary system any more than Protestantism has emancipated itself from the foundations of Catholicism.”¹³³

Like his old man, Marx expressed a negative attitude toward Catholics in his midst. Marx would remember the Catholic pupils in his class as a bunch of “peasant dolts,” which Jonathan Sperber says was probably reflective of the opinion of upper-class Protestant classmates.¹³⁴ I wouldn’t blame them. Karl Marx never needed outside influence to view people as inferior idiots and rabble, or, to borrow one of Marx’s handy phrases of derision, as the “lumpenproletariat.” It came easy to Karl to see others as slack-jawed morons.

“Giving Birth to Monsters:” Father, Son, and the Restless Spirit

By winter of 1837, the demons that young Karl wrestled with were increasingly tormenting him. He wrote his father a long, heartfelt, sorrowful letter that began, “When I left you, a new world had opened out before me, the world of love, which began by being a love deprived of all hope and full of frenzied yearnings.” In that state of mind, confessed the yearning poet-turned-philosopher to his father, “it was inevitable that lyric poetry should be my chief interest.” But sadly, he conceded, poetry “could and must be only a casual companion.” When he got to Berlin, where he had broken all previous existing ties to Trier, he began to study jurisprudence and, “above all,” felt “an urgent need to wrestle with philosophy.”¹³⁵

The unrest reflected in his poetry, along with its associated demons, would be transferred to his philosophy.

Karl finished this letter, dated November 10, 1837, at about four in the morning, as the candle went out and he could no longer see what he had written. Nearing his final thoughts, he wrote, “A deep unrest has mastered

me, and I shall not be able to lay the specters that haunt me until I am in your dear presence.”¹³⁶

The man who would write about the specter of communism that haunted Europe was writing about the specters haunting him. A deep unrest had mastered him.

One biographer referred to this as a “monumental” letter from the son to the father, which is fair to say (I have quoted only a small portion). It took the father some time to digest it. On December 9, Heinrich Marx vomited out his response in an epic letter oozing with bile. He vented at the boy. What Heinrich wrote is worth quoting at length:

God’s grief!!! Disorderliness, musty excursions into all departments of knowledge, musty brooding under a gloomy oil-lamp; running wild in a scholar’s dressing-gown and with unkempt hair instead of running wild over a glass of beer; unsociable withdrawal with neglect of all decorum and even of all consideration for the father. ... I am almost overwhelmed by the feeling that I am hurting you, and already my weakness once again begins to come over me, but in order to help myself, quite literally, I take the real pills prescribed for me and swallow it all down, for I will be hard for once and give vent to all my complaints. I will not become soft-hearted, for I feel that I have been too indulgent, given too little utterance to my grievances, and thus to a certain extent have become your accomplice. I must and will say that you have caused your parents much vexation and little or no joy....

On several occasions we were without a letter for months, and the last time was when you knew Eduard was ill, mother suffering and I myself not well, and moreover cholera was raging in Berlin; and as if that did not even call for an apology, your next letter contained not a single word about it, but merely some badly written lines and an extract from the diary entitled *The Visit*, which I would quite frankly prefer to throw out rather than accept, a crazy botch-work which merely testifies how you squander your talents and spend your nights giving birth to monsters; that you follow in the footsteps of the new immoralists who twist their words until they themselves do not hear them; who christen a flood of words a product of genius because it is devoid of ideas or contains only distorted ideas....

As if we were men of wealth, my Herr Son disposed in one year of almost 700 talers contrary to all agreement, contrary to all usage, whereas the richest spend less than 500. And why? I do him the justice of saying that he is no rake, no squanderer. But how can a man who every week or two discovers a new system and has to tear up old works laboriously arrived at, how can he, I ask, worry about trifles? How can he submit to the pettiness of order? Everyone dips a hand in his pocket, and everyone cheats him, so long as he doesn’t disturb him in his studies, and a new money order is soon written again, of course.¹³⁷

The father was incensed not only at the son’s selfishness, personally and financially, but that the son squandered his talents and dad’s money “giving birth to monsters.” He did so as he “every week or two” ripped up old works and discovered new systems. The father continued to fulminate, finishing with a nasty flourish:

True, these poor young fellows sleep quite well, except when they sometimes devote half a night or a whole night to pleasure, whereas my hard-working talented Karl spends wretched nights awake, weakens his mind and body by serious study, denies himself all pleasure, in order in fact to pursue lofty abstract studies, but what he builds today he destroys tomorrow, and in the end he has destroyed his own work and not assimilated the work of others. In the end the body is ailing and the mind confused, whereas the ordinary little people continue to creep forward undisturbed and sometimes reach the goal better and at least more comfortably than those who despise the joys of youth and shatter their health to capture the shadow of erudition, which they would probably have achieved better in an hour's social intercourse with competent people, and with social enjoyment into the bargain!!!

I conclude, for I feel from my more strongly beating pulse that I am near to lapsing into a soft-hearted tone, and today I intend to be merciless.

The old man was being merciless alright. Not that the son had been selfless. Karl was selfish, and Heinrich let him know it, returning again to a theme that would always obsess Karl: money.

I must add, too, the complaints of your brothers and sisters. From your letters, one can hardly see that you have any brothers or sisters; as for the good Sophie, who has suffered so much for you and Jenny and is so lavish in her devotion to you, you do not think of her when you do not need her.

I have paid your money order for 160 talers. I cannot, or can hardly, charge it to the old academic year, for that truly has its full due. And for the future I do not want to expect many of the same kind.

To come here at the present moment would be nonsense! True, I know you care little for lectures, though you probably pay for them, but I will at least observe the decencies. I am certainly no slave to public opinion, but neither do I like gossip at my expense. Come for the Easter vacation—or even two weeks earlier, I am not so pedantic—and in spite of my present epistle you can rest assured that I shall receive you with open arms and the welcoming beat of a father's heart, which is actually ailing only through excessive anxiety.

The old man was at least willing to open his arms to his prodigal son—the son of the restless spirit, the son up late in the dark giving birth to monsters.

In presenting this letter in his biography of Karl Marx, Robert Payne notes that Heinrich finished with a shaking hand, concluding to his son that he could not write anymore. He was incensed.

The father died a few months later, on May 10, 1838, at age fifty-six. “Marx did not attend his father's funeral,” recorded Payne. “The journey from Berlin was too long, and he had other things to do.”¹³⁸

Marx as Son, Father, and Moocher

With the death of his father, Marx turned to his mother—for money.

Heinrich's death was especially tragic because he was the only influence who seemed to inspire discipline in Karl's life. The mother now faced an uphill battle all to herself. "Let me know when you have received the money," she wrote to her son on October 22, 1838, trying to satisfy his cash demands after his father's death and with graduation looming. Henrietta expressed a heartfelt plea, "May the good God give you happiness in all your undertakings and lead you along the right path."¹³⁹

One must wonder if Karl laughed at that poignant wish from his mom, or shook his fist at her letter. He was not thinking about a good God. Maybe there had already been one too many thoughts, put in writing, in verse, about the one who rebelled against God.

Quite apart from Marx's writings, the devil also seemed to have a role in the daily details of his life in more mundane but likewise troubling ways. Among them, Marx the family man left much to be desired. What follows is a mere glimpse of Marx as a man—that is, as a son, a father, a husband, a partner.¹⁴⁰

Karl's strained, abusive relationship with family and money got worse when he began his own family.

Marx had viewed his parents parasitically, like a leech drawing blood from its host. He did this not only as a teen and young adult but as he himself became a parent and had children and teenagers. The man refused to work for wages, instead sucking as much income from his parents as possible.

The host in such a relationship eventually has no recourse but to cut off the parasite—to the parasite's writhing displeasure. Marx's parents would need to financially cut him off, enraging Marx in the process. He was draining dry his parents' lifetime savings. His suffering mother expressed the wish that "Karl would accumulate capital instead of just writing about it."¹⁴¹

His suffering wife would say the same: "Karl, if you had only spent more time making capital instead of writing about it, we would have been better off."¹⁴²

Karl was too busy devising his self-important theories in his personal office or public library to bother earning an income to provide for his family. He demanded that others provide his income. His parents were the

go-to source. Long before there was Minnie the Moocher, there was Marx the Moocher.

It would have been nice if Karl had merely gotten a job. Naturally, those who suffered most from Marx's refusal to secure work was his family, which was destitute from his laziness. His wife and kids lacked money, food, a steady roof over their heads, and even medical attention. He demanded more and more from his parents, until they could no longer give more and insisted on some tough love for their selfish son.

Well, that was enough for Karl. What a dastardly slight that was! He told his parents where to go (a place he knew well from his poetry). Some biographers claim or imply that he ultimately refused to attend his father's funeral out of spite.¹⁴³ Perhaps. He no doubt distanced himself from his mother.

Marx would make his first visit to his mother in nearly twenty years for the sake of pressuring her for cash. The guilt-trip and cornering of his mom did not go well, prompting Marx the moocher to write his wife with a complaint about the old woman: "She does not want to hear a word about money but she destroyed the I.O.U.'s that I made out to her; that is the only pleasant result of the two days I spent with her."¹⁴⁴

Curse the old hag! The forever-prodigo son sauntered back to London whimpering and whining with his tail between his stodgy legs. But at least the old bat tore up the IOUs. At least the momentary reconciliation produced something of value for Karl—the "only pleasant result" of his time with his mother.

But the committed communist was not finished finding a way to hit up the old lady for more subsidies. Karl got himself a lawyer to ensure he raked in a healthy share from the elderly woman once she died in 1863.

He clearly did not care much about her, especially once his dad had departed. "With his father's death he suddenly found himself without a family, for his mother meant nothing to him," sums up one Marx biographer. "When he thought of her at all, it was always cold-bloodedly; she was the woman who prevented him from reaching his full flowering because she controlled the family fortune and refused to part with it. The sullen, smoldering rage against his mother, as it appears in his letters, is not pretty to contemplate."¹⁴⁵

Unfortunately for Karl, his mother outlived her husband by a good twenty-plus years. Still, this better-late-than-never scheme paid off handsomely for the champion of the proletariat. He would receive about \$6,000 in gold and francs compliments of his decaying mother's corpse.

All along, Marx continued badgering other family members, trying to squeeze his uncles for cash. In 1862, he got off his library-bound posterior to go to Holland to angle one of his uncles, who told him to take a hike and get a job, which Karl naturally refused to do. It is not clear from historical accounts if this was the same uncle from whom Marx had already gotten \$800 earlier. That money, like the \$650 he inherited from his wife's uncle and the \$1,050 he bilked from his wife's mother, all quickly disappeared, to the great consternation of his wife.¹⁴⁶

The laziness in all of this is obvious, but the hypocrisy is especially outrageous. Consider that point 3 in Marx's and Engels's ten-point plan in the *Manifesto* called for "abolition of all right of inheritance." Like so many communist kingpins who would follow, Marx and Engels were exempting themselves from the stringent rules they were writing for the remainder of humanity: other people in the world did not deserve inheritances, but Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels damn well did.

Speaking of Engels, now Marx needed a new host from which to draw financial nutrients. He thus turned to his partner in crime and in cash. Engels, too, suckled from the teat of his parents' inheritance, which was apparently fatter than the Marx family cow.¹⁴⁷ But for Engels, too, Marx's mooching quickly became excessive and obscene. Engels was tossing his parasitical partner as much as \$1,825 per year in 1850, which was a lot of money at the time, but Marx found a way to burn through it rapidly.¹⁴⁸

"Marx was continually begging money from him," writes one biographer. "Day after day, week after week ... Marx could not hide his envy of Engels's wealth. He was always urgent and uncompromising. He seemed to be holding a pistol to Engels' head and saying that the money must come, or else."¹⁴⁹

Of course, Marx envied everyone's wealth. Marxism and communism thrive on envy of others' wealth.

Eventually, the gun to Engels's head got to him. He tired of Marx the miser using him for money. And as Engels slowed the spigot, Marx lashed out at him as well, and the moocher's family endured worse hardship.

Engels was particularly offended when the girlfriend he had long shackled up with and refused to marry suddenly died and Marx, rather than extend more than cursory sympathy, asked him to further extend the cash flow. Engels had informed Marx of the tragic news of the death of his love, but Marx responded by lamenting his more important financial situation: “The devil knows there is nothing now but ill luck where we are,” moaned Marx. “I simply don’t know any more where to turn. My attempts to rake up money in France and Germany have failed, besides the children have no shoes or clothing to go out in.” In case the mourning Engels—whose mistress was not even in the grave—did not get the hint, Marx flat-out asked his grieving pal for more money. This prompted a peeved Engels to express his displeasure at Marx’s insolence: “All my friends, including bourgeois acquaintances, have shown me on this occasion, which was bound to touch me very closely, more friendship and sympathy than I could expect. You found the moment well chosen to advertise the superiority of your cold philosophy; so be it.”¹⁵⁰

Well, at least Engels understood that the (shared) philosophy was cold. Engels’ dead lady-friend, Mary Burns, was barely cold, and Karl Marx was holding out his cold hat for cold coin. Leave it to Engels to play the role of Karl’s sucker. He continued to ladle out the silver to the Marx clan.

Marx’s insensitivity is so obvious that even his most ardent admirers do not defend it. Biographer Mary Gabriel pauses here to acknowledge that this was one of “many instances” in which Marx showed himself to be a “deeply self-centered man.” For two decades, Engels had considered his mistress Mary his unofficial wife of sorts. He grieved to Marx in a letter written the next day that she had died “quite suddenly. Heart failure or apoplectic stroke. ... I simply can’t convey how I feel. The poor girl loved me with all her heart.” As Gabriel calculates, the first two lines of Marx’s response expressed his surprise and dismay about Mary, followed by thirty-one lines on Marx’s financial problems.¹⁵¹

Engels was so peeved that he waited a week before responding. When he did, said Gabriel, “it was in the imperious Prussian tone that terrified his adversaries.” Even lousy bourgeois acquaintances had shown him greater sympathy and friendship. But not Karl. “So be it then!” Engels thundered.¹⁵²

This was the one instance in which Engels was so ticked at Marx that their relationship almost came to an end.¹⁵³ But not quite. Friedrich would saunter back to continue fulfilling his role as Karl's top sap and sugar daddy.

Boiling Mad

In November 1849, one year after publishing his crowning work, the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx's landlord evicted him and his family because of communism's founding father's revulsion at the idea of an individual providing for himself and his family. Marx would have ached for an all-encompassing, cradle-to-grave, womb-to-tomb, collectivist-welfare state that confiscates revenue from wealthy people and redistributes it to lazy socialist academics and theorists peddling inane ideas from their messy desk piled with papers.

The landlord was also fed up with Marx's resistance to grooming. Karl drank too much, smoked too much, never exercised, and suffered from warts and boils from the lack of washing. He stunk. "Washing, grooming and changing his linens are things he does rarely, and he likes to get drunk," stated a Prussian police-spy report. "He has no fixed times for going to sleep or waking up." As for the family apartment, "everything is broken down," busted, spilled, smashed, falling apart—from toys and chairs and dishes and cups to tables and tobacco pipes and on and on. "In a word," said the report, "everything is topsy-turvy. ... To sit down becomes a thoroughly dangerous business." Quite literally, the chair you chose to sit upon in the Marx household could collapse.¹⁵⁴

This was symptomatic not only of Marx's house but himself. Just as the house was dirty and infested and broken down, so was Karl. Especially gruesome were the boils that plagued his bottom (and everywhere else). He suffered from them for more than twenty years.

"The boils varied in numbers, size and intensity," wrote Paul Johnson, "but at one time or another they appeared on all parts of his body, including his cheeks, the bridge of his nose, his bottom, which meant he could not write, and his penis. ... They brought on a nervous collapse marked by trembling and huge bursts of rage."¹⁵⁵

At one point in London in the spring of 1854, Marx had grown a particularly unpleasant boil between his upper lip and nose, hindering his

ability to speak. “My face has reached a crisis,” he grimaced in a letter to Engels. He fingered a possible culprit for his suffering, a not unreasonable one: “For fourteen days the devil has been hurling shit at my head.”¹⁵⁶

Hmm. Perhaps Marx was joking there. Perhaps. Or is this yet another example where maybe we should take him literally when writing about the devil?

Marx was compelled to wax biblical on some of these occasions, such as his suffering. He told Engels that he was “the object of plagues just like Job, though I am not so God-fearing as he was.” Indeed. He said on yet another occasion amid his two-plus decades of boils that he felt like a “real Lazarus,” and asked Engels, “Wouldn’t it have been more reasonable to send these trials of patience to some good Christian, someone like Silvio Pellico?”¹⁵⁷

The boils got so bad that at times he could only stand upright or lie on his side on the sofa.¹⁵⁸ The man who said that religion was the opium of the masses ended up taking opium for his boils, as well as doses of arsenic. He and his doctors were perplexed at the cause of the boils, which was not a disease picked up by anyone else in the Marx household. (Marx’s obsession with not bathing would seem a rather obvious contributing factor.)

Marx’s boils might have been at their worst when he was writing *Das Kapital*, which might explain the sense of oozing pain one feels when reading this blistering piece of work. “Whatever happens,” he groaned to Engels, “I hope the bourgeoisie as long as they exist will have cause to remember my carbuncles.”¹⁵⁹

You bet they have. Marx’s boils persisted in the lives of that very bourgeoisie. They more than remembered his intellectual boils which fester to this day.

Toss the Bum Out

Marx was, in short, a slob. He was sloppy in his home life, in his desire to earn an income, in his keeping of papers, and even in his research. He avoided the factories and farms for which he devised prodigious plans for their mass nationalization and collectivization. He did his research never from the field but exclusively from the library. He embodied the worst stereotype of isolated academics who never deign to intermingle with the

rubes they profess to represent. The champagne socialist at Columbia University sees no need to actually sit at a kitchen table in Peoria with some farmer-bumpkin who votes Republican and clings to his God and guns.

Even sympathetic sources underscore Marx's failure to provide for his family. "He and Jenny, his wife, spent the majority of their life together in considerable and frequently miserable poverty, relying on contributions from supportive friends (most reliably Friedrich Engels)," states a writer at the left-wing *Salon*. "If this was hard on Marx, it was surely harder still on Jenny."¹⁶⁰ Jenny herself had been raised as what we today would call a "limousine leftist." (In Jenny's day, perhaps a horse-and-carriage leftist.) Born in Prussia, she was four years older than Karl and was brought up in an aristocratic family. She gave up her life of privilege for a life with Karl.

For the record, Jenny likewise turned against religion. She and Karl had wedded at a Protestant church in the town of Kreuznach in June 1843. Hardly anyone attended. Neither Marx's parents nor anyone from his side of the family came, and the only family member from Jenny's side were her mother and brother Edgar. Whatever religious feelings they had at that point must have been left at the altar. Jenny likewise was not impressed by religious people, once creating a short list of her "aversions"—"knights, priests, soldiers."¹⁶¹

Jenny was also averse to Christian religious relics, as was her husband. As she remained in Germany while Karl was in Paris, she wrote to him in lament about the enthusiasm of Catholic pilgrims who had come to town for a special veneration of the Holy Coat at the Trier cathedral, which had drawn in many religious enthusiasts. "People seem to have gone mad," she scoffed in a letter to Karl, knowing he would join her in her condescension toward these superstitious fools. "I suppose all hell is breaking loose with you, too."¹⁶²

In fact, hell already had broken loose with regard to Karl and the Holy Coat. Recall his perverse poem "The Player." For that poetic drama, Marx had not only written words but had arranged the stage furniture and the wardrobe for all his characters in his production. To that end, Marx dressed his satanic violinist in a wrinkled gown that Marx had derived from—yes—the Holy Coat at the grand cathedral in Trier.¹⁶³

Chillingly, if not sacrilegiously, such was the robe of Marx's man as he played out his pact. As he cut loose with his violin and his "blood-dark

sword,” his soul resounding in the “depths of Hell,” with “hellish vapors” filling his brain, boldly playing the “dance of death,” he donned the Holy Robe of Jesus Christ.

Nice, Karl. Real nice.

A Pact with the Devil

Not surprisingly, Karl and Jenny had no enthusiasm for passing religious faith on to their children. When Christmas was acknowledged at the Marx household, it was viewed entirely as a secular event. When the children asked Papa Karl about the origins of Christmas, he explained the story of Christ as a tale of a poor carpenter killed by wealthy men.¹⁶⁴ Yet again, Marx shoehorned the message through his prism of wealth, money, and class. Even the life of Christ had to be about economics.

Marx’s daughter Eleanor remembered fondly at age five or six being taken to a Roman Catholic church and being stirred by the “beautiful music,” and thus “feeling certain religious qualms.” Her dad, however, disabused her of these childish sentiments. No matter what she was *feeling*, her father argued that Christianity did not have a rational answer. As Eleanor said, her father stated “many and many a time” that “after all we can forgive Christianity much, because it taught us the worship of a child.”¹⁶⁵

Later, when Marx offered to send his daughters to a boarding school, the girls declined because of the “religious rites.” When his daughter Laura got married, it was a civil marriage in London. No church.¹⁶⁶ It sounds like Marx had trained them well.

And while Marx did not want to put the fear of God into his children, he seemed to have few qualms about putting the fear of Satan into them. When he was in London, Marx liked to tell what Robert Payne describes as “an interminable story” to his children during Sunday walks to Hampstead Heath. This was a tale about an imaginary character named Hans Rockle, who kept an enchanted toyshop and who (like Marx) was always in debt. The shop had all sorts of intriguing toys and woodcarvings: little men, kings, queens, dwarves, birds, animals. Rockle was no mere toymaker, however. He was a magician, but his powers were limited because he could never fully meet his obligations to the devil. “He made his pact with the devil,” writes Payne, “and there was no escaping from it.” And whereas

some of Marx's stories about Hans were "wryly humorous," writes Payne, "others made the children's hair stand on end." Eleanor recalls the stories being as frightening as the stories of the Gothic horror novelist of the day E. T. A. Hoffmann.¹⁶⁷

And yet, here is the crucial moral to this story. In Payne's assessment:

There can be very little doubt that those interminable stories were autobiographical, and that Hans Rockle, who bought and sold wooden men and was always in danger of losing them to the devil, was Karl Marx presiding over the fortunes of economic man. The pact with the devil was the central theme of *Oulanem* and appears in various disguises in many of his early poems. It was a subject on which Marx had brooded frequently, not only in his youth. Goethe's *Faust* was his bible, the one book which he regarded with unreserved admiration, and he liked to roar out the verses of Mephistopheles, just as he liked to sign himself "Old Nick." He had the devil's view of the world, and the devil's malignity. Sometimes he seemed to know that he was accomplishing works of evil.¹⁶⁸

Among these works, Payne here continued, are certain images that constantly recur in Marx's writing such as death, torture, executioners, mutilation, even ruptured wombs, as well as the ferocious manner in which he blistered his enemies with gutter language and vicious words. Payne is justified in asserting that Marx spent much of his life in a "helpless rage against the world. ... In letter after letter he roars his disgust at the world and at people, with unbridled malevolence."¹⁶⁹

Marx even dealt with his allies this way. Friends of many years could quickly find themselves non-persons, the subjects of his derision and vituperation and diatribes. As detailed at length by several biographers, Marx was often dictatorial with his editorial staff and with his Communist League and Party. Payne chronicles what he aptly terms Marx's "purges," a haunting bellwether for how various Communist Parties, from Russia to America to worldwide, would deal ruthlessly with internal dissenters who did not always toe the Party line. "The purges were not invented in Soviet Russia," writes Payne. "They appeared at the very beginning of Marxist communism, and were part of the system."¹⁷⁰

In all, concludes Payne, "there were times when Marx seemed to be possessed by demons, when rage overflowed in him and became poison, and he seemed to enter into a nightmare." Like in the drama *Oulanem* and other writings and poems, there was a penchant for nihilism and destruction.¹⁷¹

And returning to Hans Rockle, remember that this was a favorite story that Marx would share with his children on Sunday walks in London. These were the very Marx children who likewise ended up not only atheists but hopeless atheists—that is, truly people with no hope, to the point (in some cases) of suicide. This was the dark world-view that Marx’s daughters inherited and learned from their father.

Karl and Jenny: The Extraordinary Misery of Being a Marx

Prior to London, where Karl and Jenny would spend most of their married life, one of their earliest stops in starting their family and ideological sojourn had been in Brussels, where they moved in February 1845 and had their first child, Laura. They took up residence at the *Bois Sauvage* boardinghouse on the Place St. Gudula. Located in the heart of Brussels, the Marx abode was towered over by the great Cathedral of St. Michael, which, as one Marx biographer notes, almost seemed to be situated above Marx as a “constant reminder of the terrific power of Marx’s enemy the Church.”¹⁷² That is the very Church whose pope, Leo XIII, composed the prayer to St. Michael to “defend us in battle” against the “wickedness and snares of the Devil” and to “thrust into Hell Satan and all the evil spirits who prowl about the world seeking the ruin of souls.”

The young Marxes spent two years in the shadow of St. Michael, as Karl composed the *Communist Manifesto*. It was just the start for Marx in many ways. Here began not only an ideological battle against money but a personal one, which took a terrible toll on his marriage to Jenny. He enlisted her in the battle as well.

The shameless Marx sent his wife begging to relatives. In one case, in August 1850, Jenny crossed the English Channel in a storm and arrived soaking wet at Karl’s Dutch relatives’ home, unrecognizable. According to one biographer, the uncle told the poor, disheveled, dripping wife that Marx’s family had about as much enthusiasm subsidizing godless communism as did that of Engels.¹⁷³

Karl and Jenny hoped that his masterwork, *Das Capital*, might actually earn them some capital. But Marx, who was notorious for not completing assignments, for ignoring word limits, and for missing deadlines, shirked this deadline by sixteen years. The first royalty check from the book arrived

sixteen years later still, at which point both Karl and Jenny had died; only their surviving children got some royalties.¹⁷⁴

Marx had wasted over two decades writing *Das Kapital*, a long, ridiculous tome, a waste of money as well as time. He had initially received a three hundred dollar advance for the book, but extended over twenty-three years of drawn-out writing, it equated to a little over a dozen dollars a year.¹⁷⁵

Nor did Marx's *Manifesto* against wealth and property help his financial cause. There was not even a paltry sum for the kids in the wretched winter of 1849–50, the year after it was published. That winter the Marx family sought refuge in a dilapidated boardinghouse. (Between 1848 and 1850, the Marx family were like vagabonds, transitioning between Brussels, Paris, Cologne, and London.) There, that bitterly cold season, the family baby, an infant boy named Heinrich Guido (named for Marx's father), succumbed to the elements not long after his first birthday. Really, he arguably perished a victim of his communist father's irresponsibility. Jenny connected the dots. Paul Johnson writes of Marx's wife, "Jenny left a despairing account of these days, from which her spirits, and her affection for Marx, never really recovered."¹⁷⁶

Marx meanwhile kept up pressure on his mother. In March 1851, he told her that if she did not intervene to cover one of his interminable IOUs—run up with the landlady, with shopkeepers, at the pub where Karl regularly got drunk—that she would let the police arrest him. Henrietta called his bluff on that one. She didn't budge.¹⁷⁷

Jenny wrote a letter in June 1852 pleading with her husband, "I had firmly decided not to torment you constantly with money problems, and now here I am again. But truly Karl, I no longer have any good course." She explained that the landlady was literally beating at the door. "She has really put me in a state of terror. She has already had our belongings auctioned off. And, in addition, baker, governess, tea grocer, grocer, and the terrible man, the butcher. I am in a state, Karl, I no longer know what to do. For all these people, I am exposed as a liar."¹⁷⁸

Karl Marx had placed his wife in a state of terror over money and property, just as his writings and ideology would do to countless millions in the centuries ahead.

The nadir for Jenny and Karl during these trials and woes was the death of their eight-year-old son Edgar in 1855. Mary Gabriel, author of a sympathetic biography of the couple, described vividly and painfully how Edgar died of intestinal tuberculosis, “exacerbated by ... unhealthy living conditions.” That loss was heartbreaking. No matter what Karl’s numerous transgressions, it is impossible not to feel for him when reading the wrenching accounts of the loss of little Edgar, who suddenly took ill and within a month was dead—in his father’s arms. He was a fun, adored child, and Karl apparently loved him immensely. Biographer Jonathan Sperber called Edgar’s death “the greatest tragedy in Marx’s life.”¹⁷⁹

Mary Gabriel says Mr. and Mrs. Marx’s soul-searching for answers about Edgar’s death “could have led them to only one conclusion—the revolutionary path they had chosen had killed him.” And Edgar was merely the latest victim. As Gabriel notes, by 1851, when Marx had begun writing *Das Capital*, “disease resulting from deprivation had killed two of his [Marx’s] children.”¹⁸⁰ That deprivation was beyond dispute the fault of Marx. The death of the Marx children would only continue. Edgar was far from the end of the cycle of doom.

Marx knew how this made his wife feel. He later lamented to Friedrich Engels, “Every day my wife says she wishes she and the children were safely in their graves, and I really cannot blame her, for the humiliations, torments and alarums that one has to go through in such a situation are indeed indescribable.”¹⁸¹

Marx would say of Jenny, “I feel pity for my wife.” He conceded that “our situation here is so extraordinarily miserable,” and that “my poor wife is ... completely broken down.”¹⁸²

Again, what Karl Marx really longed for was what his socialist-progressive descendants in the West would seek to bequeath: a giant collectivist/nanny state where Big Sister could assume the task of taking care of Karl’s family for him.

Karl and Lenchen

The individual who came closest to providing that service for the Marx family was a nanny named Lenchen. There, too, Marx’s duties as husband

and father left something to be desired. To the devastation of his devoted wife, Marx had a sexual relationship with the family's young nursemaid.¹⁸³

Helene Demuth, known as "Lenchen," had actually worked as a housemaid for Jenny's family, the Westphalen family. She and Jenny had essentially grown up with one another. Jenny's mom sent Lenchen to the young Marx home in Brussels in April 1845 to help out. There, under the eye of St. Michael, Lenchen was dragged into the cabal of communists and socialists brooding and boarding with Karl and Jenny at the boardinghouse.¹⁸⁴

Actually, it is not quite right to say that Lenchen worked for the Marx family, given that she toiled without pay, almost like an indentured servant for life. One Marx biographer says that Lenchen was Marx's "chattel to be exploited unmercifully." Karl, champion of the proletariat, fulminator against low-paid workers, protester against wage exploitation, never paid Lenchen a penny. The stumpy, frumpy girl gave her everything to the Marx household. She sacrificed her own personal life for the Marx family's life. Still more ironic, given that Marx himself never interacted with or had worked with the proletariat, Lenchen was the only real contact with the working class that Karl ever experienced. And Marx used the poor girl. She gave herself to him fully—mind, spirit, body.¹⁸⁵

Karl eventually bedded Lenchen behind Jenny's back. Historians have no idea how often or the exact circumstances, including whether it was consensual. "He would take his comfort where he could," wrote one biographer of Marx seeking a sexual receptacle in Lenchen. "That she was virtually his bonds slave was a matter of entire indifference to him. It was enough that she was available to serve his sexual needs at a time when Jenny was too ill to satisfy them. We shall probably never know whether he raped or seduced the servant, though the large number of images concerned with rape in his later writings suggest that it was rape rather than seduction. In due course a child was born."¹⁸⁶

In June 1851, Lenchen gave birth to a baby boy. Karl refused to ever concede that the unfortunate child was his, and naturally refused to provide a penny of child support. The illegitimate son, whose first name was left blank on the birth certificate, was eventually named Henry Frederick, or "Freddy." Marx shirked this moral responsibility too—financially as well as paternally. Engels bailed him out yet again.

“Engels had accepted paternity for Frederick,” wrote Marx biographer David McLellan. “The son was immediately sent to foster parents and had no contact at all with the Marx household.”¹⁸⁷ Engels was willing to claim responsibility for the pregnancy, though he was not about to raise the child under his own roof, which was always shared with one of the women he was living with and having sex with outside of marriage.

More precisely, what Engels did was agree to say that he was the father of the child. As one Marx biographer put it, “Engels cared not a whit about his reputation, especially with regard to women,” with whom he regularly shacked up anyway, never daring to marry.¹⁸⁸ Decades later, on his deathbed, Engels admitted that the child was Karl’s and that Engels had intervened to help his friend cover up the truth and to try to save Marx’s marriage. The adult Freddy was aware of the truth. He would live well into his late seventies, dying in 1929, outliving all of Karl’s legitimate children. Freddy left no descendants.¹⁸⁹

Of course, Marx’s devoted but despairing wife was surely not surprised, albeit heartbroken. What else did she expect from the man she referred to as her “wild black boar” and her “wicked knave?”¹⁹⁰

Marx and His Daughters

As for the other girls in the family, Marx’s relationship with his daughters is more complex and the subject of very different reporting by biographers, often depending in part on the ideological preferences of the biographers. Paul Johnson states that as Marx’s daughters grew, he denied them a satisfactory education, if any education at all, and vetoed careers for them entirely. This most adversely affected Eleanor, the youngest Marx girl, who, as Johnson put it, “suffered most from his refusal to allow the girls to pursue careers and his hostility to suitors.”¹⁹¹ As we shall see, this manifested itself in Eleanor’s marriage to an utter reprobate, a widely reviled man who seduced and slept with other women and, ultimately, killed her.

This reported rejection of his daughters having independent careers was another irony given the man’s stature among a long line of Marxist-feminists, from Alexandra Kollontai and Betty Friedan to Kate Millett and Angela Davis, Communist Party candidate for vice president of the United States, among many others.

But again, views on Marx's treatment of his daughters varies.

Jonathan Sperber shows convincingly that Marx was a kind and loving father—or, in the words of one friend and frequent visitor, “the most tender father.” That included his treatment of his daughters. Though perhaps he might have vetoed careers for his daughters (as Paul Johnson stated), Marx was determined to give them lessons expected in those days for raising “proper young ladies” (as Sperber puts it), including learning Italian, French, and receiving lessons in singing, piano, and drawing. And as noted, he and Jenny personally taught them, or at least raised them, to be (as Sperber puts it) “the same outspoken atheists that they were.”¹⁹² Marx also may have passed on to his girls his offensive outspokenness regarding members of the black race. In one letter, Marx's daughter Jenny complained to her sister Eleanor, “I drudge like a nigger.”¹⁹³ As we shall see, that was very much her father's language.

And yet, Sperber also concedes that Marx stated candidly that he preferred male offspring. We have letters revealing this. “My wife, alas, delivered a girl and not a boy,” he regretted to Engels of Jenny's deficient birthing abilities.¹⁹⁴ And as for the baby girl delivered by his daughter Jenny, Marx lamented to Jenny, “I congratulate you on the happy delivery. ... I prefer the ‘male’ sex among children who will be born at this turning point in history.”¹⁹⁵ These Marx opinions ought to receive full-throated condemnation by feminist Marxists and leftists of all stripes, who would not tolerate them if espoused by a prominent conservative thinker.

One highly favorable source, biographer Mary Gabriel, writes that Marx's daughters “adored their father.” She asserts that they were born into Marx's “revolutionary household, with all the complications that entailed,” and “they relished it.” Gabriel likewise adds that the girls were educated, including in “the values of Victorian society—music, art, literature, and languages.” They also were taught, she concedes, “a heavy dose of radical politics.” And thus, as soon as they were able, they became their father's assistants. But that would come at a political, financial, and moral price. Not until they were women, says Gabriel, did Marx's daughters fully grasp “the high price of being born a Marx.” She notes that one daughter lost all three of her young children while devoting herself “to further her father's agenda.” Another daughter gave up a cherished life as a journalist for a “miserable marriage” to one of her father's young French followers. And

the third daughter became “ensnared by a man whom she believed to be worthy of her father,” but who, in the end, drove her to suicide.¹⁹⁶

So, even a complimentary biographer like Gabriel concedes that Marx’s daughters, regardless of his level of affection for them, met tragic ends.

In my mind, those downright calamitous ends should not be separated from the hopeless atheism and despairing atheistic world-view that Marx and his wife passed on. When their daughters hit the depths of despair, they had no God to turn to; their mom and dad had taught them that God did not exist—that religion was false, that it was opium for the masses. Instead of smoking opium, they ingested poison.

In fact, four of Marx’s six children died before he did, including his oldest daughter, Jenny. The two daughters who survived him later committed suicide, one of them (Laura) in a suicide pact with her husband, a son-in-law that Marx ridiculed.¹⁹⁷ (Both of the socialist-communist daughters had been financially taken care of by Engels, who left them and their socialist-communist husbands a very healthy sum in his estate.) I will share more details of those horrible fates at the end of this chapter, as we morosely close out the lives of the Marx family.

As for the sons-in-law, that is yet another unhappy tale. Marx detested both of his sons-in-law, whom he viewed as idiots. “May the devil fly away with them!”¹⁹⁸ he exclaimed. Or, as another translation renders his wish, “To hell with both of them!”¹⁹⁹

No idle matter for a man who waxed poetic about “hellish vapors.”

In fact, it is ironic that Marx so disapproved of the girls’ suitors given that all were atheist-socialist revolutionaries just like him.

Marx’s Un-Christian Racial Views and Anti-Semitism

As we continue this discussion of Marx’s family values, we encounter another sordid element of the life of Karl that cannot be avoided and merits pause: his awful statements about blacks and Jews; we see such ugly views by Marx littered throughout his personal and professional writings.

A victim of Marx’s racism was his son-in-law, Paul Lafargue, husband of Laura. He came from Cuba, born in Santiago, later home of Marxist revolutionary Fidel Castro. Because Paul was Cuban, Marx viewed him as marred by “Negro” blood in his veins, prompting Marx to denigrate him as

“Negrillo” and “The Gorilla.”²⁰⁰ Marx complained to Engels that “Lafargue has the blemish customarily found in the negro tribe—*no sense of shame*, by which I mean shame about making a fool of oneself.”²⁰¹

Imagine the rather shameless Marx having the audacity to assess Lafargue and his entirety of “negro tribesmen” as shameless.

Stephen Schwartz, the ex-Marxist and expert on communism, states flatly that Marx effectively “disowned” his daughter for marrying a man of mixed race.²⁰² At the least, Marx strongly disapproved.

Karl Marx was a racist who cast freely with choice epithets aimed at blacks and even at Jews—ironic given that Marx was an ethnic Jew.

Jonathan Sperber notes that Marx’s correspondence is “filled with contemptuous remarks about Jews.”²⁰³ Even his admiring biographer Francis Wheen, who habitually defends the worst in Marx, admits that he “sprayed anti-Semitic insults at his enemies with savage glee.”²⁰⁴

Of one contemporary, Marx blasted his “cynical, oily-obtrusive, phony-Baronial Jew-manners.”²⁰⁵ His fellow German socialist and labor organizer Ferdinand Lassalle, Marx referred to as a “greasy Jew,” “the little kike,” “water-polack Jew,” “Jew Braun,” “Yid,” “Izzy,” “Wily Ephraim,” “Baron Itzig,” and “the Jewish Nigger.” Referring to Lassalle in a July 30, 1862 letter to Engels, Marx discerned with a sense of confident pride, “It is now perfectly clear to me that, as the shape of his head and the growth of his hair indicates, he is descended from the Negroes who joined in Moses’ flight from Egypt.” Lassalle’s “cranial formation,” asserted Marx, a strict and proud evolutionist, was the giveaway. Of course, Marx was willing to allow for an exception: “unless his mother or grandmother on the father’s side was crossed with a nigger.” With a mordant twinkle in his eye, Marx concluded, “This union of Jew and German on a Negro base was bound to produce an extraordinary hybrid.” Marx hastened to add, “The fellow’s importunity is also niggerlike.”²⁰⁶

Walter Williams, the economist and well-known black conservative, states unequivocally that “Marx was an out and out racist and anti-Semite.”²⁰⁷

Marx’s single worst written expression of that anti-Semitism was his painful-to-read essay “On the Jewish Question.” The essay was written in the fall of 1843 and published in 1844 in the journal *Deutsch-Französische*

Jahrbucher. The article was actually a review of two Bruno Bauer books published in 1843, *The Jewish Question* and *The Capacity of Today's Jews and Christians to Become Free*.²⁰⁸ The essay is classic Marx—meaning that it is long, rambling, meandering, and largely incoherent and incomprehensible. After paragraph upon paragraph and page after page of wasted ink, Marx finally—about three-quarters into yet another interminable screed—gets to something of historical value and personal insight when he cuts loose and lets us know what he really thinks about Jews. Upon reading his words, one wonders how a single Jew could ever speak well of Karl Marx after this, let alone call himself a Marxist.

“What is the worldly cult of the Jew?” asked Marx in “On the Jewish Question.” His answer: “Haggling. What is his worldly god? Money. Very well! Emancipation from haggling and money, and thus from practical and real Judaism, would be the self-emancipation of our age.”

Ironically, it was Karl Marx himself who treated money as his worldly god—money, economics, class, materialism. This seems a more accurate diagnosis by Marx of himself—that is, autobiographical. Nonetheless, Karl was on a roll. His target here was Jews. He growled, “Money is the jealous god of Israel before whom no other god may exist. ... The bill of exchange is the actual god of the Jew. His god is only an illusory bill of exchange.” Still more from Marx: “What is contained abstractly in the Jewish religion—contempt for theory, for art, for history, for man as an end in himself—is the *actual conscious* standpoint and virtue of the money-man. ... The woman is haggled away. The chimerical nationality of the Jew is the nationality of the merchant, of the money-man in general. The Jew's unfathomable and unbounded law is only the religious caricature of baseless and bottomless morality and law in general.”

Marx repeated those words throughout the essay: *haggling*, *money*, *egoism*. The Jew, Marx snarled, was “impossible.” The German thus concluded, “The emancipation of the Jews, in the final analysis, is the emancipation of mankind from Judaism.”

Damn those money-grubbing Jews! *The world needed emancipation from the Jew*. That was a sentiment that Adolph Hitler certainly shared.

In his seminal edited volume on Karl Marx and religion, Saul Padover sums up Marx's anti-Semitic views: “Marx ... imbibed the ancient hostility to his people and accepted all the ugly stereotypes of the brutally caricatured Jew then widely prevalent in Europe, and not only among

Lutherans. He learned to despise and hate the people from whom he originated. This was an expression of what the Germans call *Selbsthass* (self-hate), a trait which Karl Marx displayed throughout his whole life.”²⁰⁹

Padover was taken aback by “the extent and virulence of his anti-Semitism.” Marx was indeed a self-hating Jew.

Likewise cynical about Jews, and no doubt an influence on Marx, was his Jesus-mocking buddy, Bruno Bauer. Bauer snorted that the Jew “was much too concerned” with “satisfaction of natural needs.” Jewish religious attitudes were “the mere cleverness of sensual egoism,” they were “crude and repulsive,” they constituted “hypocrisy.” In it all, the Jew “is and remains a Jew.” To Bauer, Christianity was at least a step toward human emancipation, whereas Judaism was a historical dead end.²¹⁰

Sperber notes that when Karl Marx wrote to Arnold Ruge in 1843 that the “Israelite faith is repulsive to me,” he was referring to Bruno Bauer’s attitudes. Sperber goes on to credit Bauer as no less than “one of the founders of racial anti-Semitism in central Europe,” such was his “vehement” anti-Semitism.²¹¹

Also impacting Marx in this regard was his friend Moses Hess, one of the original eighteen members of the Communist League (along with Marx, Engels, and even Jenny).²¹² Hess had an influence on Marx via an unpublished essay on Jews, money, and capitalism that Marx read before he wrote “On the Jewish Question.” How anti-Jewish was Hess? He had written to Arnold Ruge that after the abolition of capitalism and with the creation of a communist society, it would be necessary to guillotine “just a few ... property owners, stubborn bankers, Jews, capitalists, landowners and landlords.”²¹³

Yes, guillotine. Chop off the heads of a few Jews, along with other reptiles.

The admiration between Marx and Hess was mutual. Hess described Marx as a combination of Heinrich Heine and several others, calling him “my idol ... he combines the deepest philosophical seriousness with the most cutting wit; imagine Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine and Hegel united in one person ... then you have Dr. Marx.”²¹⁴ Hess thrilled that “Dr. Marx, as my idol is called, is still a very young man (about 24 years old) and will give medieval religion and politics their last blow.”²¹⁵

Who was Heinrich Heine? He was still another anti-Semitic influence and friend of Marx, at once loathsome and infamous for his radical political and religious views. It is Heine who is credited by some for the analogy of religion as the “opium” of the people, with Marx getting it from him.²¹⁶ Heine described Hamburg, Germany, as a “city of hagglers” filled with “baptized and un-baptized Jews (I call all Hamburg’s inhabitants Jews).”²¹⁷

Alas, we cannot exclude Engels’ influence here. Marx’s partner in crime was not much better in matters of race and ethnic tolerance. Engels also was unimpressed with Marx’s son-in-law, Paul Lafargue, and likewise for racial reasons. Engels, a fellow Darwinian, endeavored to deduce with scientific accuracy that Paul possessed “one-eighth or one-twelfth nigger blood.” In 1887, Lafargue had been a political candidate for a council seat in a Paris district that contained a zoo. In an April 1887 letter to Paul’s wife, Laura, Engels cruelly opined, “Being in his quality as a nigger, a degree nearer to the rest of the animal kingdom than the rest of us, he is undoubtedly the most appropriate representative of that district.”²¹⁸

Is it any wonder that Marx’s son-in-law had such low self-esteem? In fact, one day in November 1911, Paul decided to end it all. He killed himself in a suicide pact with Marx’s daughter Laura.

Blessed Is He Who Has No Family

Home was not a happy place for the Marx family. In 1862 Marx wrote a letter to Engels noting that every day his wife expressed a wish to die, such was her misery.²¹⁹ In another letter to Engels during one of Marx’s many financial crises, Marx asserted to his partner, “Blessed is he who has no family.”²²⁰

That is a curious twisting of the Beatitudes. Jesus seemed to have left out that one.

As for marriage, Marx wrote to Engels, who surely would have nodded in assent, “There is no greater stupidity than for people of general aspirations to marry and surrender themselves to the small miseries of domestic and private life.”²²¹ In a letter to his future son-in-law, Paul Lafargue, Marx asserted, “If I had to live my life over again, ... I would not marry.”²²² (This correspondence was related to the question of Lafargue’s prospects for marrying Marx’s daughter, and Marx did not approve of

Lafargue—that is, “Negrillo.” He was happy to do his part to help dissuade “The Gorilla.”)

In so many ways, Karl Marx’s personal life reinforced his desire for the kind of revolutionary state that he not only wanted but needed; such was also true for Engels and many of the long line of communist revolutionaries, from Lenin to Mao to Castro to Che and on and on. Again, one thinks of the trenchant insight by Aristotle: “Men start revolutionary changes for reasons connected with their private lives.”

They do indeed. Marx lived the life of an atheist communist revolutionary and, it may be noted, died the death of one as well. So did his wife.

Jenny died in London on December 2, 1881.²²³ She was buried in unconsecrated ground at Highgate Cemetery. Her husband did not attend the funeral. He was apparently too weak to attend, confined to a bedroom and unable to move and, reportedly, forbidden by his doctor to go to the funeral.²²⁴ Engels gave the eulogy, a despairing ode, what one biographer described as an “atheist confession of faith:” “The place where we stand is the best proof that she lived and died in the full conviction of atheist Materialism,” averred Engels, soberly staring at a pile of dirt. “She knew that one day she would have to return, body and mind, to the bosom of that nature from which she had sprung. And we, who have now laid her in her last resting-place, let us cherish her memory and try to be like her.”²²⁵

Engels exhorted the atheist faithful to take pride and joy in their shared conviction that the vivacious Jenny was now reduced to mere dust. How thoroughly comforting this must have been to the daughters she and Karl had raised to reject any belief in the supernatural! They could all—the gathered, the secular faithful—aspire to Jenny’s memory and try to be like her: a stiff corpse, *rigor mortis*, rotting in a box, food for parasites. What a noble image. What a Marxist image.

As for Jenny’s despairing atheist husband, Karl hung on longer, depressed, weak, miserable, before succumbing to an unbreathing nothing two years later. He was buried next to Jenny on March 17, 1883. His coffin bore not a cross but two red wreaths, faithful to the communist religion to the very end. Engels again gave the eulogy, invoking not God but Darwin, whom Marx had admired for dealing such a grand blow for materialism and atheism.²²⁶

Death Becomes Her—and Her

Engels would not live long enough to deliver the eulogy at the next two Marx funerals. And these were Marxes he had loved and known from their births.

The first to go, in March 1898, was Marx's daughter Eleanor, who poisoned herself upon learning of her husband's (like her father's) infidelity. Here, too, was a sad tale from the family Marx.

Eleanor's husband, Edward Aveling, was a scoundrel. The son of a London Congregational minister, he was a playwright, actor, political activist, seducer of women, and all-around reprobate. And not unlike Eleanor's father, Aveling, a left-wing writer and aspiring politician, was egocentric, had a ferocious temper, and had an uncanny inability to earn money. He was a cad and shameless sponger, who even sought out and bilked Marx's illegitimate son Freddy for cash, which he never repaid.²²⁷ Eleanor had other suitors, including the playwright and notorious dupe of communist causes, George Bernard Shaw, who was said to have been "half in love" with Marx's daughter but found her too strong-willed and neurotic.²²⁸ Another notorious British socialist, eugenicist Havelock Ellis, who carried out an adulterous relationship with Planned Parenthood matron Margaret Sanger (who was married with children), likewise spent time with Eleanor, but he, too, left her to the claws of Aveling.²²⁹

Eleanor became Aveling's mistress. They openly lived together in London prior to marriage, during which he engaged in a pattern that he would continue throughout their marriage: philandering. Associates described him as a "disreputable dog." All were shocked at the awful manner in which he treated his wife.

Eleanor had tried to kill herself at least once before with an opium overdose that failed. She would try again with urging from Aveling, who convinced her of a joint suicide. The plan was that they would die together in each other's arms. Eleanor consummated her end of the bargain on the evening of March 31, 1898, using a combination of chloroform and prussic acid, suggested by Aveling, who did his research well. As for Aveling himself, a cheat to the end, he did not keep his promise to Eleanor. With Eleanor dead, Aveling retreated to his twenty-two-year-old girlfriend, and inherited all of Eleanor's possessions that had been bequeathed by her

father, including his book royalties and a massive collection of papers and documents.²³⁰

In truth, Aveling had killed her, and yet was never charged with murder, even as many felt he should have been.

Thirteen years later, tragedy struck again, this time striking down the only remaining Marx daughter. It was the next Marx girl's self-arranged date with the grim reaper. Laura and her husband, Paul, entered into their own death pact. Paul Lafargue, Marx's "Gorilla," or "Negrillo," acted as executioner, and (unlike Aveling) kept his half of the bargain. Their joint suicide came the night of November 25–26, 1911. In the role of a future Jack "Dr. Death" Kevorkian, Paul had administered an injection of potassium cyanide into Laura that night, before injecting himself in the morning.

"Healthy in mind and spirit, I kill myself before pitiless old age," wrote Paul in his suicide note. "For many years, I promised myself not to live past seventy years; I picked that year for my departure from this life and I prepared the mode of execution for my resolution: an injection of potassium cyanide."²³¹

Recall, of course, that Karl Marx's poetry had included suicide pacts. And such was the path followed by his daughters. One wonders if the very notion had entered the daughters' minds at some point compliments of the warped, destructive thoughts of the father. These were indeed the sins of the father. This is not to say that the father wanted suicide for his daughters. Not at all. But one wonders what grim things the girls might have heard from or had implanted in their imaginations and subconscious by their father at home.

No less a sower of death than Vladimir Lenin himself spoke at the funeral of Laura and Paul. Even Lenin, a man for whom death was an intimate companion, was alarmed at the latest Marx girl's suicide pact. "No, I cannot approve it," Lenin protested to his wife of the Laura-Paul pact. "They could still write, they could still accomplish things, and even if they could no longer work efficiently they could still observe and give good advice." They could still devote themselves to the cause.²³²

Like Lenin, Paul's eternal bride was communism. Likewise faithful to the communist religion to the very end, Paul concluded, "I die with the supreme joy of having the certitude that, in the very near future, the cause

for which I have devoted some forty-five years will triumph. Long live Communism! Long live International Socialism.”²³³

His death, too, would bequeath a legacy of just that: death. Thus began and ended the family Marx.

CHAPTER 4

“MONSTER OF TEN THOUSAND DEVILS”

ENGELS ENCOUNTERS MARX

As we move ahead in this book, beyond Marx, we should never forget that Marx had an accomplice, a willing partner in this wretched enterprise of constructing a communist-atheist world. His name was Friedrich Engels, and he was every bit Karl Marx’s equal and co-author.

There is so much that could be said about Engels biographically in this book. But with the focus here being on the faith aspect of Marx and Marxism, and even how that related to family matters, this chapter will stay within those parameters. Those details alone will be revealing and disturbing enough.

Meeting a Remarkable Monster

We have had several alarming glances at the devil and Karl Marx, particularly as embodied in the poetry of the co-founder of communism. But let us not neglect Marx’s co-redeemer of the dystopia. He, too, had something to say about the devilish side of Marx, and also did so via the medium of poetry.

Friedrich Engels’s upbringing was, like that of Marx, both interesting and sad. He was raised and for many years remained a committed Christian, much more so than Marx. Marx’s Jewish family had converted to the faith

of Christ reportedly more out of his father's calculation of cultural necessity in the society they lived in. Such was not Engels's father and family.

Friedrich Engels was born in November 1820 in Barmen, Germany, a town known for its piety. His family was no exception to the community's devoutness. "He did not acquire his revolutionary opinions in the home of his parents," recorded Franz Mehring. "His father was a well-to-do manufacturer of conservative and orthodox views, and religiously Engels had more to overcome than Marx."²³⁴

Engels would work at his father's "damned business," as he called it. His heart was never in it.²³⁵ Nonetheless, it was a good thing he did, because his future partner, Marx the moocher, would need that hard-earned capital someday so that he and Friedrich could squander it writing about the vagaries of capital and the wonders of forcibly redistributing businessmen's earnings and property.

Though his heart was never in the business, it was in the church. Leaving the faith was much more difficult for Friedrich. Though born in Barmen, he lived in Bremen, which was also a stronghold of German piety. "I pray every day, indeed almost all day, for truth," Engels would write, "and I have done so ever since I began to doubt."²³⁶ Like many youth, he had his questions, and he needed peers who were good men, who would help guide him to right, not to wrong—to truth, not to evil. Unfortunately, men like Karl Marx entered instead.

It was in Bremen that Engels began to really question his faith. One biographer described it as nothing less than a "crisis of faith," exacerbated and intensified by reading the works of the Young Hegelians.²³⁷ He was getting hit from all corners, including by the odious Moses Hess, who convinced him of the *virtues* of communism. Engels's father was so concerned about these subversive influences that he sent Friedrich to Manchester, England, to work with family business partners in order to get him away from his atheist German friends. Engels wryly recorded that his new infatuation with communism had "reawakened all the religious fanaticism of my old man." The father and other relatives were greatly troubled; this was a matter not only of Friedrich's politics but, with communism, his soul. "You have no clue," he wrote to Marx, "of the malice of the Christian hunt, complete with its beaters, on my soul."²³⁸

Well, Karl was there to lend a hand. He would enthusiastically pull Friedrich away from God. He was happy to do his dirty work by beating back the Christians.

Men like Marx came and darkened the door to Engels's heart for Christ. And here again, it might not be overstating things to say that Marx felt like a demonic presence to Engels. Or at least that is not an unreasonable interpretation. Engels himself seemed to say as much, if we can take him literally and assume that one particular missive that he wrote about Marx was not in jest.

Like Marx, Engels penned his own verse. In fact, he penned verse about Marx, about encountering Marx and his foreboding presence.

He Hops and Rages Without Rest

Engels wrote of a “hellish song, howling [a] refrain.” Like Marx's hellish vapors, they emanated from Marx. He was tormented, apparently, by the encroaching figure of Karl Marx.

Engels had not yet met Marx. He knew of him, but they had not come into contact. But he could nonetheless sense him, feel him.

What Engels wrote can be interpreted in more than one way. As with so much of his writing, like that of Marx, it is often difficult to discern exact meaning and intention, whether serious or satirical or something else altogether. It can be maddening when trying to figure out just what in the world these men were trying to say. Who were they talking about? When? Why? What in the devil's name were they saying on this or that occasion?

239

On this occasion, Franz Mehring, the definitive early biographer of Marx—who first collected Marx's major writings and posthumous papers (directly from Marx's daughter Laura), and who was a major German communist, revolutionary socialist, and Social Democrat who knew well Marx's immediate descendants—writes of an Engels poem published in four cantos under the title *A Christian Epic*. I have read all four cantos, variously posted and sourced by others under different titles, and find their overall meaning practically impenetrable—not unlike much of Marx's ludicrous body of writing. They are frustrating in the extreme, bizarre, bewildering. As Mehring interprets this particular poem, Engels was “satirizing the ‘triumph of belief’ over the ‘Arch-Satan’ to the great horror

and dismay of the latter.” Perhaps so. Of special interest, however, is the section dealing with the person, or *figure*, of Marx. Mehring wrote, “The verses in which he [Engels] describes himself and Marx, with whom he had not yet come into personal contact, give us some idea of his manner.”²⁴⁰

Yes, they certainly do. And it hardly seems satirical, unless this is one very dark, black comedy by Engels. As if prompted by something shady and murky—something that Engels described as “black”—something ominous which his way was coming, Engels was compelled to pen these lines about his future partner (original German followed by English translation):

Wer jaget hinterdrein mit wildem Ungestum?
Ein schwarzer Kerl aus Trier, ein markhaft Ungetum.
Er gehet, hupfet nicht, er springet auf den Hacken
Und raset voller Wut und gleich als wollt’ er packen
Das weite Himmelszelt und zu der Erde ziehn,
Streckt er die Arme sein weit in die Luft hin.
Geballt die böse Faust, so tobt er sonder Rasten,
Als wenn ihn bei dem Schopf zehntausend Teufel fassten.

Who chases after his tracks [Engels’s tracks] with reckless rage?
A black man from Trier [Marx’s hometown], a remarkable monster,
He neither walks nor hops, but springs upon his heels
And stretches high his arms into the air in anger
As though his wrath would seize at once
The mighty canopy of Heaven and tear it to the earth,
With clenched and threatening fist he rages without rest,
As though ten thousand devils had seized him by the hair.²⁴¹

This, dear comrade, was Friedrich Engels’s poem about first meeting Karl Marx, with whom he had not yet come into contact. Was this satirical? A parody? Or was the author dreadfully serious?

Robert Payne, the Marx biographer who so carefully dissected the dark recesses of Marx’s poetry, makes no suggestion that this particular poem should be taken as satire. He stated that these lines reflect what “men remembered” about Marx: “his wild temper, his impetuosity, his habit of

leaping upon his prey. He would clinch his fist and roar interminably for the remaining forty years of his life.”²⁴² Payne, in fact, translated the original passage this way:

Who comes rushing in, impetuous and wild—
Dark fellow from Trier, in fury raging,
Nor walks nor skips, but leaps upon his prey
In tearing rage, as one who leaps to grasp
Broad spaces of the sky and drag them down to earth,
Stretching his arms wide open to the heavens.
His evil fist is clenched, he roars interminably
As though ten thousand devils had him by the hair.

Payne’s translation of this passage is a popular one, and a good one. Note the phrase “ten thousand devils had him by the hair.” Here is a Marx with “evil fist” clenched who “roars interminably.” It is a frightening image, no matter what the translation. (My translation probably goes easier on Marx.)²⁴³

This was the Marx that would saunter into Engels’s life as Engels struggled to keep the faith, as he sought to “find my way to God, for whom I shall long with my whole heart.” The young Engels had written some beautiful Christian poetry, waxing lovingly, longingly, for God. The pre-Marx Engels had earnestly hoped that “I am not lost.”²⁴⁴ Tragically, however, as Engels struggled, Karl Marx entered his life and changed its direction, reversing Engels’s ascent to better angels. He needed men of Christ; he instead ran into an anti-Christ.

Marx did chase on Engels’s tracks, a man marked by reckless rage. This was the blackened, dark man from Trier—nay, a *remarkable monster*—who neither walked nor hopped but sprung on his heels. This creature stretched his arms high into the air, as if his wrath would immediately seize the mighty canopy of heaven and tear and fling it to the earth. That beast—Karl Marx—would do so with clenched fist, a threatening fist that raged without rest, as if—yes—ten thousand devils had seized him. So wrote Engels.

Again, how serious was this verse by Engels? How are we to interpret it? In its time, and henceforth today? Well, we should not overstate it, nor should we understate it. We should not ignore it.

Whatever might have been the initial intention of his verse, Friedrich Engels, unfortunately, could not resist the Marx, the thing that sprung on its heels. He apparently succumbed to his spell.

By the end of his life, Engels was hopeless. “He was absolutely without God,” recalled a friend.²⁴⁵

Two hopeless men engaged in a godless cause to ruthlessly undermine the existing order, Karl and Friedrich would join forces, and history would never be the same. Their “specter of communism” was unchained and unleashed. It was as if ten thousand devils were celebrating, and ten thousand million victims (or more) would succumb to the clenched fists of rage that morphed into the hideous Frankenstein monster that was Marxism-Leninism.

It was an ideology governed by a demon far more Faustian than heavenly.

Engels on the Family

Lastly, a parting word on Friedrich Engels and family matters.

For the record, Marx’s intellectual partner was no great family man either. Engels refused a family and marriage altogether. He juggled a regular mix of mistresses, including in the 1840s, when he and Karl compiled their magnum opus. These ladies pleaded with Engels to make honest women out of them, to take them to the altar rather than merely to bed. They were asking too much of the co-author of the *Communist Manifesto*.

At one point in the 1850s, Engels seemed to begin referring to one of these girls as his “wife,” though he would not officially marry her. When that woman died, he seems to have perhaps married another sexual partner, who happened to be the late woman’s sister, but only on her deathbed.²⁴⁶ That option, after all, entailed less responsibility for the communist.

Like Marx, Engels’s ideological preferences were extensions of his personal preferences. In his writings and in his description of his communist paradise, Engels showed his preferences for pre-marital sex, non-committed relationships, and easy divorce.

This was apparent a year after Marx’s 1883 death, with the publication of Engels’s 1884 book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. This book, as Engels noted in the preface, also represented Marx’s

views on family. In fact, said Engels, Marx himself had eagerly wanted to undertake this crucial work. He said that Marx had produced extensive extracts right up until his death, which Engels had reproduced in the book “as far as possible.” Indeed, Professor H. Kent Geiger, in his seminal Harvard University Press book on the subject, notes that “many of the ideas” in *The Origin of the Family* can be found in the first joint work by Marx and Engels, *The German Ideology*, which was not published during their lifetimes. Geiger states that *The Origin of the Family* was really a “joint work” by the two founders of Marxism, based on an “impressive unity and continuity” across four decades of their mutual thoughts.²⁴⁷

What sort of thoughts? Engels reiterated a position in the book that both he and Marx had previously advanced—namely, that a mother’s housework was yet another private thing that the communist state should seize, to be replaced by collective labor managed by the state. Private housework would be nationalized, with mothers instead being corralled into the fields and factories to do more *meaningful* work. Housework, from cooking to cleaning, would become a government industry, as would childcare, which would become a communal affair. Mothers and wives would thereby be liberated from the chains of traditional family *economic bondage*.²⁴⁸ “Private housekeeping is transformed into a social industry,” Engels envisioned excitedly. “The care and education of the children becomes a public affair; society looks after all children alike, whether they are legitimate or not.”²⁴⁹

Again, the ironies and hypocrisy here are rich, given Marx’s exploitation of the family nursemaid, Lenchen.

In all, Engels and Marx saw this plan as a joyous means to help further their goal of “abolition of the family,” expressed in the *Communist Manifesto*. “The single family ceases to be the economic unit of society,” hoped Engels.²⁵⁰

Of course, in all of this, Engels had his eyes fixed on the figure of the single woman, and how these new-fangled ideas of liberation might personally redound to his own sexual benefit. “This removes all the anxiety about the consequences which today is the most essential social-moral as well as economic factor that prevents a girl from giving herself completely to the man she loves,” wrote Engels. “Will not that suffice to bring about the gradual growth of unconstrained sexual intercourse and with it a more

tolerant public opinion in regard to a maiden's honor and a woman's shame?"²⁵¹

Friedrich Engels certainly hoped so.

The woman would be freed to give herself more totally (and physically) to the man she "loves," especially as child care, rearing, and education became a public affair, a social industry. For Engels, that "love" meant sex, not marriage. As for child rearing, Professor Geiger notes that Engels and Marx appeared to have "little to say" about the relationships between parents and children beyond the crucial recommendation that "they would not continue to live together, because society was to rear and educate" (Geiger's words). This collective rearing of children by the communist nanny state would bring "real freedom" to all members of the family. Parenting would become the responsibility of the state.²⁵²

What a perfect statist vision for two men who eschewed father-hood and the idea of marital fidelity and commitment. Yet again, we see how the theoretical-ideological utterances of the revolution have roots in the personal-private lives of the founders.

And as for the revolution, it would now proceed vigorously and viciously into the twentieth century, no longer by men like Marx and Engels but by remarkable monsters with names like Lenin and Stalin and Mao and Pol Pot and the Kims and Ceausescu and Fidel and Che. These men, too, were hell-bent on a cause that would howl gigantic curses at mankind. It was as if ten thousand devils had them by the hair.

Friedrich Engels, in his verse, was more an unwitting prophet than poet.

PART 3

**THE BOLSHEVIK WAR
ON RELIGION AND THE
CHURCH'S RESISTANCE**

CHAPTER 5

“WE DO NOT BELIEVE IN GOD”

LENIN'S NECROPHILIA

“Communism begins where atheism begins,” declared Marx.²⁵³ In the *Communist Manifesto*, he and Engels remarked, “Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion, and all morality.”²⁵⁴

The apostles of Marx and Engels took that to heart. In communist Russia, the Bolsheviks in particular picked up the spear.

“A fight to the death must be declared upon religion,” asserted Nikolai Bukharin, founding editor of *Pravda* and one of Lenin’s and Stalin’s leading lieutenants, adding counsel to “take on religion at the tip of the bayonet.”²⁵⁵

Bukharin spoke for the Bolsheviks: “Religion and communism are incompatible, both theoretically and practically. ... Communism is incompatible with religious faith.” He also spoke for Marx: “‘Religion is the opium of the people,’ said Karl Marx. It is the task of the Communist Party to make this truth comprehensible to the widest possible circles of the laboring masses.”²⁵⁶

The Bolsheviks would do just that. Communists worldwide would do just that. Such was the atheist legacy bequeathed by Marx.

One of the most brutally restricted rights by communist governments was, and remains, the freedom to worship, which communists always and everywhere have attacked with a wild fervor and devotion. In a sense, it is strange that atheistic communists felt so mortally threatened by their people

believing in something they insisted did not exist. Yet, communists not only cared about that worship but became utterly obsessed with stopping it. Belief in God stood in the way of the totalitarian desire to transform human nature. God was a competitor to communist control of the body, mind, and spirit of man that Marx and Lenin wanted to redefine in their own image.

In other words, the communists rightly recognized that belief in God was the chief impediment to the imposition of their atheist creed.

“That Religion of Theirs”

Ironically, anyone familiar with or who spent time in the Communist Party will attest that its arrogantly and proudly atheistic members treated communism like a faith.

The writings of Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin were accorded a sacred status. In the Soviet state and other communist regimes, these writings had effectively replaced the Bible in public life and in the lives of so many communists everywhere. They constituted the new Sacred Scripture. Mikhail Gorbachev denounced the phenomenon. At the July 25–26, 1991 plenary session of the Soviet Central Committee (one of the final such sessions in the soon-moribund USSR), Gorbachev derided what he aptly called “communist fundamentalism,” and said that in the Soviet Union the writings of Marxism-Leninism had been turned into “a collection of canonical texts.”²⁵⁷

In the United States, Arthur Koestler, the renowned ex-communist, spoke of the believer’s religious-like conversion to the Marxist faith. He explained in his classic *Darkness at Noon*:

To say that one had “seen the light” is a poor description of the mental rapture which only the convert knows. ... The new light seems to pour from all directions across the skull, the whole universe falls into pattern like the stray pieces of a jigsaw puzzle assembled by magic at one stroke. There is now an answer to every question, doubts and conflicts are a matter of the tortured past. ... Nothing henceforth can disturb the convert’s inner peace and serenity—except the occasional fear of losing faith again, losing thereby what alone makes life worth living, and falling back into the outer darkness.²⁵⁸

And with rapturous communism entrancing and absorbing the convert, the party was treated as an infallible authority.

“None of us desires or is able to dispute the will of the Party,” stated Leon Trotsky, whose later dissent from and criticisms of Stalin would lead

to his excommunication by the Kremlin. “Clearly, the Party is always right. ... We can only be right with and by the Party, for history has provided no other way of being in the right.”²⁵⁹

The esteemed diplomat and scholar George F. Kennan described this as the “infallibility of the Kremlin.” He noted that communists, like the old “white dog before the phonograph,” responded only to “the master’s voice.” That master was the Kremlin. “Truth is not a constant but is actually created, for all intents and purposes, by the Soviet leaders themselves,” wrote Kennan in his classic dispatch “The Sources of Soviet Conduct.” “It may vary from week to week, from month to month. It is nothing absolute and immutable—nothing which flows from objective reality.” Kennan explained, “The Soviet concept of power requires that the Party leadership remain in theory the sole repository of truth. ... The leadership of the Communist Party is therefore always right.” Since “they alone knew what was good for society”—and since their word was “absolute,” “immutable,” “infallible,” “secure and unchallengeable”—the Soviet leadership was “prepared to recognize no restrictions, either of God or man, on the character of their methods.”²⁶⁰

Their only guiding force was themselves and their Marxism-Leninism. That was what they answered to.

Ronald Reagan called it “that religion of theirs, which is Marxism-Leninism.”²⁶¹ He said that communists bowed to “the nativity according to Marx and Lenin,” a system in which “Karl Marx is hailed as the messiah.”²⁶²

Lenin on Spiritual Booze and Dope

Thus the hypocrisy and irony of Marx’s disciples professing official atheism as they blindly adhered to their philosophy like religious zealots.

And yet, Lenin affirmed Marx’s sentiment that communism begins where atheism begins. He considered atheism a natural and inseparable part of Marxism, of the theory and practice of “scientific socialism.”²⁶³ “Religion is opium for the people,” said Lenin, echoing Marx. “Religion is a sort of spiritual booze.”²⁶⁴

Lenin saw socialism as incompatible with religious belief, asserting, “Everyone must be absolutely free to ... be an atheist, which every socialist

is, as a rule.” Again, Marx said the same, and so did Engels. Marx’s son-in-law, the notorious Edward Aveling, who knew Engels well, said of him, “He held, of course, that Christian socialism was a contradiction in terms, and felt very strongly that Christians have no more right to label socialism with the limiting adjective of their shibboleth than we should dream of speaking of atheistic socialism.”²⁶⁵

Lenin decried “this or that dope by the established church. Complete separation of church and state is what the socialist proletariat demands of the modern state and the modern church.” Sounding like a twenty-first-century secular progressive in America, Lenin insisted that “religion must be declared a private affair.”²⁶⁶ Like Bukharin and other Bolsheviks, he demanded an ironclad “separation of church and state.”²⁶⁷

Lenin wrote that in 1905. Once he and his Bolsheviks took over, they refused to tolerate religion even as a private affair. The party would not accept that. Lenin conceded as much in that 1905 letter: “We demand that religion be held a private affair so far as the state is concerned. But by no means can we consider religion a private affair so far as our Party is concerned.” He continued, “We demand complete disestablishment of the Church so as to be able to combat the religious fog. ... We founded our association, the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, precisely for such a struggle against every religious bamboozling of the workers. And to us the ideological struggle is not a private affair, but the affair of the whole Party, of the whole proletariat.”²⁶⁸

Lenin summed up, “The revolutionary proletariat will succeed in making religion a really private affair, so far as the state is concerned. And in this political system, cleansed of medieval mildew, the proletariat will wage a broad and open struggle for the elimination of economic slavery, the true source of the religious humbugging of mankind.”²⁶⁹

That is what religion was to Lenin: a humbug, a medieval mildew; spiritual booze, spiritual dope.

In another dispatch four years later, Lenin again invoked Marx: “Religion is the opium of the people—this dictum by Marx is the cornerstone of the whole Marxist outlook on religion.” Here, Lenin was writing in May 1909, and on behalf of fellow “Social Democrats.” What he wrote is worth quoting here at length:

It is the absolute duty of Social-Democrats to make a public statement of their attitude towards religion. Social-Democracy bases its whole world-outlook on scientific socialism, i.e., Marxism. The philosophical basis of Marxism, as Marx and Engels repeatedly declared, is dialectical materialism—a materialism which is absolutely atheistic and positively hostile to all religion. ... Religion is the opium of the people—this dictum by Marx is the cornerstone of the whole Marxist outlook on religion. Marxism has always regarded all modern religions and churches, and each and every religious organization, as instruments of bourgeois reaction that serve to defend exploitation and to befuddle the working class....

Marxism is materialism. As such, it is as relentlessly hostile to religion. ... We must combat religion—that is the ABC of *all* materialism, and consequently of Marxism. But Marxism is not a materialism which has stopped at the ABC. Marxism goes further. It says: We must *know how* to combat religion, and in order to do so we must explain the source of faith and religion among the masses *in a materialist way*. The combating of religion cannot be confined to abstract ideological preaching, and it must not be reduced to such preaching. It must be linked up with the concrete practice of the class movement, which aims at eliminating the social roots of religion.²⁷⁰

It is hard to find a more scathing indictment than this. Marxism, insisted Lenin, is “absolutely atheistic and positively hostile to all religion.” It is “relentlessly hostile to religion.” Communists thus “must combat religion,” eliminating its very roots. This must be done, said Lenin, in order to reverse religion’s hold on the “backward sections of the town proletariat”—that is, the town idiots.

Could a priest be a Social Democrat and member of the Communist Party? Of course, but then what kind of priest would want to do so? And yet even in the year 2019, one hundred years and one hundred million corpses later, the Jesuit-run *America* magazine would publish a breathtaking piece, at once bizarre and heretical, titled “The Catholic Case for Communism.”²⁷¹ Even in Lenin’s day, apparently a terribly confused or misled priest or two must have occasionally expressed interest in working with Lenin and his brute atheists. Lenin considered the absurd thought, answering and explaining:

The question is often brought up whether a priest can be a member of the Social-Democratic Party or not, and this question is usually answered in an unqualified affirmative, the experience of the European Social-Democratic parties being cited as evidence. But this experience was the result, not only of the application of the Marxist doctrine to the workers’ movement, but also of the special historical conditions in Western Europe which are absent in Russia (we will say more about these conditions later), so that an unqualified affirmative answer in this case is incorrect. It cannot be asserted once and for all that priests cannot be members of the Social-Democratic Party; but neither can the reverse rule be laid down. If a priest comes to us to take part in our common political work and conscientiously performs Party duties, without opposing the program of the Party, he may be allowed to join the ranks of the Social-Democrats; for the contradiction between the spirit and principles of our

program and the religious convictions of the priest would in such circumstances be something that concerned him alone, his own private contradiction. ... But, of course, such a case might be a rare exception even in Western Europe, while in Russia it is altogether improbable. And if, for example, a priest joined the Social-Democratic Party and made it his chief and almost sole work actively to propagate religious views in the Party, it would unquestionably have to expel him from its ranks.²⁷²

Hence, if a left-wing priest was dimwitted enough to join the ranks of Lenin and friends, well, they would accept the help of the *useful idiot* (Lenin's language) for their revolution.²⁷³ But if the strange priest ever tried to share his faith with the fellas, well, he would be shown the boot and the door.

“Unswervingly Combating Religion”

Lenin spoke often of religion as the opiate of the masses, parroting his materialist idol.²⁷⁴ This became dogma to the Communist Party both under Lenin and after his death. The program of the Communist International, adopted at the Sixth World Congress in 1928, four years after Lenin's death, stated, “One of the most important tasks of the cultural revolution affecting the wide masses is the task of systematically and unswervingly combating religion—the opium of the people.”²⁷⁵

Fittingly, given his penchant for vitriolic, over-the-top rhetoric and hate-laced, hatchet prose, Lenin himself said far worse about religion.

“All worship of a divinity is a necrophilia,” declared Lenin in a letter to Maxim Gorky, written in November 1913. To Lenin, religion was so odious, so loathsome, that the best analogy was necrophilia: a person aroused at the notion of having sexual intercourse with a stiff human corpse. He scowled that “any religious idea, any idea of any god at all, any flirtation even with a god, is the most inexpressible foulness ... the most shameful ‘infection.’”²⁷⁶ (According to one Russian scholar and translator, Lenin here was referring to venereal disease.²⁷⁷)

Lenin seemed torn between whether religion was more like a burning, oozing sexually transmitted disease or something more akin to the vile, unimaginable act of having sexual intercourse with a hardened human corpse. He considered religious belief to be beyond contempt; his only struggle being how best to adequately describe its vileness. Like a cankerous sore, it needed to be stanchd. Those who transmitted it must be quarantined, and the houses where they gathered must be shut down or

burned down. His views are perhaps best summed up in the following sentence which he wrote to Maxim Gorky: “There can be nothing more abominable than religion.”²⁷⁸

Lenin boasted that as a teen, he removed the cross that hung from his neck and literally trashed it. “I broke sharply with all questions of religion,” he fondly recalled. “I took off my cross and threw it in the rubbish bin.”²⁷⁹ That gesture was a metaphor for how he, his Bolsheviks, and other communists viewed and treated religion. On December 25, 1919, celebrated as Christmas Day in the West, Comrade Lenin issued the following order in his own writing: “To put up with ‘Nikola’ [the religious holiday] would be stupid—the entire Cheka must be on the alert to see to it that those who do not show up for work because of ‘Nikola’ are shot.”²⁸⁰

That was, in effect, what Lenin and his disciples spent the next decades doing to the religious-minded people in the cursed places where they seized power.

In one of his most significant public speeches, made in October 1920 to the Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League, Lenin stated without equivocation, “We do not believe in God.”²⁸¹ The full context of that Lenin assertion is worth quoting and examining more closely:

Is there such a thing as communist ethics? Is there such a thing as communist morality? Of course, there is ...

In what sense do we reject ethics, reject morality?

In the sense given to it by the bourgeoisie, who based ethics on God’s commandments. On this point we, of course, say that we do not believe in God. ... We reject any morality based on extra-human and extra-class concepts.

On what then was communist “morality” based? To what was it subservient? Lenin answers these questions:

We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the proletariat’s class struggle. Our morality stems from the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat.

The old society was based on the oppression of all the workers and peasants by the landowners and capitalists. We had to destroy all that, and overthrow them but to do that we had to create unity. That is something that God cannot create....

Our communist morality is also subordinated to that task. We say: morality is what serves to destroy the old exploiting society and to unite all the working people around the proletariat, which is building up a new, communist society.

Communist morality is that which serves this struggle and unites the working people against all exploitation, against all petty private property; for petty property puts into the

hands of one person that which has been created by the labor of the whole of society....

When people tell us about morality, we say: to a Communist all morality lies in this united discipline and conscious mass struggle against the exploiters. We do not believe in an eternal morality, and we expose the falseness of all the fables about morality. Morality serves the purpose of helping human society rise to a higher level and rid itself of the exploitation of labor....

Communist morality is based on the struggle for the consolidation and completion of communism.

Such were the depths, or limits, of “communist morality.” Such a *morality* was a totally relativistic one directed to the goal of advancing communism. The only *morality* that communists recognized was that which advanced their own interests. To that end, millions would be killed if they slowed or stood against the advancement of those interests. That was *communist morality*. Communists did not believe in an eternal morality. There was no morality outside of themselves.

And what Lenin particularly disliked, and feared, was not a corrupt priest, who was easily countered because of his corruption, but a holy priest who was not so comprised and thus more difficult to vilify before the people. “The Catholic priest corrupting young girls (about whom I have just read by chance in a German newspaper) is much less dangerous,” averred Lenin. “For it is easy to expose, condemn and expel the first priest, while the second cannot be expelled so simply; to expose the latter is 1,000 times more difficult.”²⁸²

Lenin preferred his priests unholy. A sacrilegious priest was Lenin’s kind of priest. All the better for taking down the churches and religion.

The Militant Godless

For Vladimir Lenin and his comrades, rejecting God was not enough. The Bolsheviks sought to be proactive, undermining belief for generations to come. Lenin and Trotsky launched the League of the Militant Godless, which was tasked with the dissemination of anti-religious propaganda.²⁸³

Trotsky, too, was a true believer. He believed that God could not save man, but communism sure could. Consider these words from that otherwise cynical man:

Man will, at last, begin to harmonize himself in earnest. ... He will want to master first the semi-conscious and then also the unconscious processes of his own organism: breathing, the circulation of blood, digestion, reproduction, and, within the necessary limits, subordinate them to the control of reason and will. ... The human species, the sluggish *Homo sapiens*,

will once again enter the state of radical reconstruction and become in his own hands the object of the most complex methods of artificial selection and psychological training. ... Man will make it his goal ... to create a higher sociobiological type, a superman, if you will. ... Man will become incomparably stronger, wiser, more subtle. His body will become more harmonious, his movements more rhythmic, his voice more melodious. ... The average human type will rise to the heights of an Aristotle, Goethe, Marx. And beyond this ridge, other peaks will emerge.²⁸⁴

We see here how Trotsky, how Lenin, how the Bolsheviks, how communism, sought to make a New Man. Communism held the key to the self, to the universe, to human nature. We see here the full faith in the totalitarian project of fundamental transformation, of fundamentally transforming human nature, of “radical reconstruction.” But it would always be without God—or, that is, without the Judeo-Christian God. It would be with the god of Marxism-Leninism, the new faith for the New Man, a superman—*incomparably stronger, wiser, more subtle*. Here was a progressive evolution to a more harmonious and melodious “higher sociobiological type.” The communists would harness nature, lassoing it in a way that some phony “God,” some ridiculous and cruel “opiate of the masses,” could never match.

One could under communism aspire to the greatest of heights—the level of men like Goethe and Marx. So waxed Leon Trotsky, heart filled, tears in eyes, lump in throat. One could glimpse beyond the ridge a new peak, a new height for the New Man to ascend. The political pilgrim might bellow out the “Communist Internationale” as he climbed this secular Mt. Everest. *Forward!*

Trotsky found his gods in Marx and Darwin. “Darwin destroyed the last of my ideological prejudices,” he triumphed. He said the “facts” about the world and life and its origins were established for him via this “certain system” of evolutionary theory. “The idea of evolution and determinism,” he wrote, “took possession of me completely. Darwin stood for me like a mighty doorkeeper at the entrance to the temple of the universe. I was intoxicated with his ... thought.” Trotsky historian Barry Lee Woolley explained, “Trotsky took up the faith of Marx and Darwin. The conversion experience was genuine and thorough.”²⁸⁵ The feeling was mutual for Trotsky’s atheist followers, who, as Woolley put it, “adored him as a god.”²⁸⁶

The overall atmosphere and attitude of communists might have been best captured by ex-communist Whittaker Chambers, who said that Marxist-Leninists repeated man's first mistake in the Garden of Eden, the fatal conceit that "Ye shall be as gods." In so doing, they despised the notion of the one true God. As Alexander Solzhenitsyn recorded in *The Gulag Archipelago*, "Within the philosophical system of Marx and Lenin ... hatred of God is the principal driving force."²⁸⁷

It was indeed, and the tragic consequences of that hate would be the death of millions of innocent people and a dagger at Western civilization itself.

Prosecuting the War

This Bolshevik contempt for God as the driving force in civic life resulted in an arresting change to Russian society. Prior to Trotsky, Lenin, and their cohorts, respect for religious faith in pre-Bolshevik Russia was rich, including among its leaders. It is hard to find a contrast more marked than the view of Christianity by the Bolsheviks compared to that of, say, Czar Alexander I some one hundred years earlier. One can see this in Alexander's 1815 Holy Alliance, an ideal he championed at the historic Congress of Vienna. Alexander dreamed of an agreement that integrated Christian morality and principles into the way that major European nations—particularly, the Quintuple Alliance of Russia, Prussia, Austria, England, and Bourbon France—conducted foreign relations. The Holy Alliance did not achieve his hopes, but it nonetheless stands as a powerful contrast in the attitude of Russia's leaders toward Christianity before and after the October 1917 revolution.²⁸⁸

With the Bolsheviks seizing power, a full-throttle war on religion was underway. "As early as the spring of 1918," wrote Soviet official and reformer Alexander Yakovlev, "an open campaign of terror was launched against all religions, and particularly against the Russian Orthodox Church." It was a "policy of terror ... felt by every religious faith." Yakovlev underscores an incident (not uncommon) in the summer of 1918 in the Yekaterinburg diocese in which forty-seven clergymen were shot, drowned, or axed to death. That was merely one cruel episode in an ongoing campaign, the originator of which, says Yakovlev flatly and

correctly, was Lenin: “His actions against religion and the Church are astonishing in their diabolical ferocity and immorality.”²⁸⁹

To that end, many policies and proclamations were launched to initiate this Bolshevik war, including these steps all started under Lenin by 1918:

All land and buildings owned for centuries by the Russian Orthodox Church were confiscated by the state, and all schools were taken from the Church. Communists favored nationalization of everything, and the Church and its property fell under that purview. So would faith itself. In a way, civic religion was first nationalized and then co-opted and transmogrified into the Marxist-Leninist faith. Marxism-Leninism replaced the Russian Orthodox Church and all other conventional faiths; it became the new state religion.

The Bolsheviks immediately forbade religious instruction to anyone under eighteen years of age, and children were encouraged to turn in their parents if they taught them about God. The parental/husband-wife relationship was infringed upon in multiple intrusive ways. Marriage was transformed into a strictly civil ceremony; weddings, baptisms, and funerals were converted into bizarre “communist” ceremonies. Soviet officials instead substituted secular ceremonies infused with communist ideology, pejoratively labeled by outsiders as “red weddings,” “red baptisms,” and “red funerals.” In red baptisms, infants were given social “god-parents” who undertook to ensure the child was brought up to become a worthy “builder of communism.” The parents of newborns would promise to raise their children “not as slaves for the bourgeoisie, but as fighters against it.” Young mothers would declare: “The child belongs to me only physically. For his spiritual upbringing, I entrust him to society.”²⁹⁰ The “spiritual” upbringing would accord only with the new and approved faith of Marxism-Leninism. Moreover, the Russian Orthodox Church’s long-standing prohibition against divorce was lifted—a decision which wreaked havoc on the Russian family and led to an explosion in divorce rates.²⁹¹

Particularly ugly, Lenin’s cronies ensured that churches were destroyed or reconstituted into communist clubs, workshops, storage houses, offices, and obscene atheistic museums. The Church of the Archangel Michael, a beautiful red-brick edifice crowned with five cupolas, built in 1740 on the southwest edge of Moscow, was used to store grain.²⁹² The gorgeous Cathedral of Christ the Savior, positioned on the banks of the Moscow

River near the Kremlin, Moscow's most ornate church, was dynamited in December 1931 to make room for a new *sacred* "Palace of Soviets" desired by Stalin. Eventually, the ground was found too soft for a skyscraper. Instead, a decidedly less majestic municipal swimming pool was put in its place.

This, tragically, became the norm, the fate of Russia's holy churches. Of the 657 churches that existed in Moscow on the eve of the 1917 revolution, only 100 to 150 remained by 1976, according to official Soviet statistics. Of those, the Moscow Russian Orthodox Patriarchy said only 46 still held services by the mid-1970s.²⁹³ Among those 46, few to none were free to say what they wanted. They were monitored by full-time, state-employed "church watchers," whose job was to report those who came to the church to pray.

The task in this war on religion was immense. The USSR was a huge country that spanned twelve time zones. Within the Orthodox Church alone, there were over 40,000 churches and some 150,000 priests, monks, deans, and bishops.²⁹⁴ Whereas churches could be reduced to rubble, recalcitrant priests would need to be carted to Siberia, or sometimes simply executed. That was likewise true for stubbornly faithful nuns who were deliberately housed in special sections of the gulag with prostitutes.²⁹⁵

Within Russian churches themselves, there were innumerable holy relics, gems, and precious stones, all of special value, whether financial or spiritual. The Bolsheviks saw only a financial value, and thus initiated a forced confiscation of these items.

"The booty is enormous," said Trotsky, salivating over the "fabulous treasures" of the Church that the Bolsheviks greedily eyed up.²⁹⁶ They demanded the Church's materials. Naturally, this culminated in fierce battles, leading to the Moscow and Petrograd church trials of 1921–22. These were mere predetermined show trials by the state apparatus, employed to make priests and bishops look greedy.²⁹⁷

Lenin was furious (not unusual) when the Church would not give him and his cohorts their icons and jewels and whatever else to sell or melt down. He instructed Trotsky and the Politburo to make sure that all churches were "cleansed," to "shoot ringleaders," and to implement "the death penalty for priests." Lenin hoped, "There is a ninety-nine per cent

chance of smashing the enemy on the head with complete success and of guaranteeing positions essential for us for many decades to come.”²⁹⁸

They immediately put on “trial” the Russian Orthodox Church’s patriarch and sixteen other Church officials, all of whom were found “guilty” of not cooperating with the state. Of the seventeen defendants, eleven were ordered to be immediately shot. Patriarch Tikhon, who was persecuted with particular viciousness, denounced what he called the “Antichrist in power.”²⁹⁹

That was a damned good day for Bolshevism, emphasis on *damned*, as was the mass heist from the churches, which by November 1922 included 828,275 pounds of silver, 1,220 pounds of gold, 35,670 diamonds, and much, much more. Lenin rubbed his covetous little hands at the “hundreds of millions” of rubles before him.

Like Karl Marx, these communists who claimed not to care about property and wealth were, in fact, consumed by such material desires.

To the communists, the sheer number of church buildings, material, and people was evidence that the attempt to purge religion had to be an ongoing, aggressive, and proactive process. God and his faithful were intractable foes. The war on religion would not be an easy one, but it was, the Bolsheviks believed, a righteous one that had to be pursued at any cost. They were hell-bent on making it a success.

“Wholesale War on Religion”

There is no debate as to the Bolshevik intention: Russia expert and onetime Librarian of Congress James Billington said that Vladimir Lenin and his Bolsheviks aimed for nothing less than “the extermination of all religious belief.”³⁰⁰ From inside the empire, Soviet historian Eduard Radzinsky said the Bolsheviks had created an “atheistic empire.”³⁰¹

Nary a former Soviet official would shrink from this assessment. “Just like religious orders who zealously convert ‘heretics’ to their own faith, our [Communist] ideologues carried out a wholesale war on religion,” wrote none other than Mikhail Gorbachev in his memoirs.³⁰² He affirmed that the Bolsheviks, even after the civil war ended, during a time of “peace,” had “continued to tear down churches, arrest clergymen, and destroy them. This

was no longer understandable or justifiable. Atheism took rather savage forms in our country at that time.”³⁰³

The Soviet Union was openly hostile to religion. It was officially *atheist*. That is a key fact: to be officially atheist does not mean that a nation is irreligious or unreligious or takes no position on religion. The USSR had an official position on religion; it was not neutral. The position was that there was no God. Moreover, that atheism translated into a form of anti-religion that included a systematic campaign to try to eliminate religious belief within the USSR and everywhere outside of the Soviet Union where the Bolsheviks worked diligently to advance the frontiers of communism—most especially in Eastern Europe.

The state hostility to religion begun by Lenin was continued through the Stalin era. Believers, in fact, experienced even worse repression under Stalin, especially in the 1930s and during the Great Terror. Stalin blew up churches, jailed and killed priests and bishops and deacons, and nuns, and generally was hell-bent on squashing any and all traces of religion. In 1932, his League of the Militant Godless, started by Trotsky and Lenin, issued a five-year plan to terminate all religion. Issued on May 15, 1932, the “Five Year Plan of Atheism” set forth this goal for May Day 1937: “Not a single house of prayer shall remain in the territory of the USSR, and the very concept of God must be banished from the Soviet Union as a survival of the Middle Ages and an instrument for the oppressions of the working masses!”³⁰⁴

That was very much the mindset of Marx and Lenin. This “medieval mildew” must be scraped away.

There is a view by ill-informed outsiders that things got better in the USSR under Nikita Khrushchev, who denounced the “crimes of Stalin” in 1956 after he entered office following Stalin’s death. To the contrary, even during the so-called less violent, more open Khrushchev period, the abuse of Christian believers continued as standard procedure. One Soviet pastor remembered:

I was born into a Christian family in Tara, Siberia. My father was a pastor, and I can remember how we were viewed as spies and enemies of the nation during my childhood. Even my teachers joined in the accusations! It was rare for us to walk home from school without being kicked, or on the receiving end of laughter. In 1961, father was thrown into prison for his ministry to the church. The official charge was that he didn’t want to work and

was a parasite on society. Our church continued even though the church buildings were confiscated.³⁰⁵

One missionary sentenced to twenty-five years in prison in 1959, during the Khrushchev era, when he was routinely tortured, contended that while Khrushchev “disowned” Stalin, he “continued to do the same thing” in regard to religion. After 1959, half of the churches of Soviet Russia that then remained open were reportedly closed.³⁰⁶

The religious repression continued unabated throughout the Brezhnev era, which lasted from the mid-1960s until the early 1980s. Not until the Gorbachev era and the literal end of the USSR did the Soviet repression of religion finally cease.

The Universal Communist Assault on Religion

In all of this, the Soviet Union was reflective of the communist world as a whole. The endemic atheism translated into a form of vicious anti-religion that included a systematic, often ruthless campaign to eliminate belief that began at the outset of the Soviet state and still continues in various forms in communist countries to this day, from China to North Korea to Cuba.

This comprehensive, universal armed assault on religious faith was aimed not just at Christians—Protestants, Catholics, Eastern Orthodox—but against Jews, Muslims, Buddhists, and members of other faiths. So many martyrs, so many victims, so many tortured. Where to start? Who all to name?

One particularly painful example of religious persecution by Eastern European communists was the case of Hungarian priest-turned-cardinal Joseph Mindszenty. Born March 1892 in Hungary, Mindszenty was ordained to the priesthood in June 1915 before being consecrated a bishop in 1944, an archbishop in 1945, and ultimately appointed primate of Hungary by Pope Pius XII in October 1945. Only ten months later, on December 26, 1946, the communists celebrated the Christmas season by arresting Cardinal Mindszenty.

That December 26, just after midnight, the communist tormentors arrived at Mindszenty’s home in the dark of night. Police cars swarmed in. Police charged inside with guns pointed at the priest and others in the room, including Mindszenty’s trembling mother, who had brought cookies and sausage to celebrate Christmas with her son. The priest quietly dressed,

grabbed his breviary, and tried to speak some comforting words to his elderly mother.

There were sixteen communist police. They drove the cardinal to the torture house at 60 Andrassy Street. They arrived at three o'clock in the morning. For nearly forty days and nights, Mindszenty was tortured. Interrogators at the inhuman secret police headquarters excelled not only at beatings but brainwashing and drugging. The communist guards poked and prodded and ridiculed him, exhaled smoke in his face, told him dirty jokes, profaned his presence and his faith, as the cardinal sat dressed in what he later described as a "clown suit."

At one stage in this novel form of communist-crucifixion-without-killing, Mindszenty was kept awake for thirty-five hours while peppered and badgered and bludgeoned by his inquisitors. At another point, he was kept awake for eighty-two hours, during which two nuns were brought before him and punched and pounded to a pulp. The priest tried to bring his two hands together to pray for them but could not reconcile the left and the right. When the image of the thrashed sisters did not compel his "confession," two similarly bloodied priests were escorted in, swollen beyond recognition, hair soaked with blood, necks and arms blue, and bloodied feet.

In his cell between beatings, Mindszenty grew weak from eating limited rations of food and drink that he knew was drugged. He recognized the drugging procedure. Mindszenty had forewarned his countrymen that any "confession" he made should be understood as made under severe duress and in an altered state of mind.

During the communist show-trial that followed, sensationally staged the week of February 3, 1949, Mindszenty, framed by a stack of fabricated documents, reportedly "confessed" before his accusers. He was convicted of treason. The triumphant kangaroo court sentenced him to life in prison.

Pope Pius XII had his say: he excommunicated all individuals involved in the conviction.³⁰⁷

Mindszenty spent the next eight years in a solitary confinement that nearly killed him. He was released in 1955 because of ill-health but kept under surveillance. During the 1956 Hungarian uprising, he was freed by rebel forces. Rather than flee, he took residency in the US embassy, refusing to leave his country unless the communist government rescinded

his conviction, which, under pressure from the Kremlin, it would not do. He offered up his suffering as a living martyr to Christian life under communism—or, as Bishop Fulton Sheen called him in a 1957 TV broadcast, the “Dry Martyr of Hungary.”³⁰⁸ The communists persecuted him for two and a half decades. Mindszenty concluded that communism is “a kind of religion” that “knows no God, no immortal soul.”³⁰⁹

Mindszenty was hardly alone. For every Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary, there was a Cardinal Wyszynski or Fr. Jerzy Popieluszko in Poland, a Richard Wurmbrand in Romania, a Natan Sharansky or Walter Cizek in Russia, a Vasyl Velychkovsky or Severian Baranyk or Zenobius Kovalyk in the Ukraine, a Moaddedi clan in Afghanistan, a Lutheran or Methodist missionary or follower of the Dalai Lama in China, a jailed nun in Cuba, or one of tens of thousands of Buddhist monks forced to renounce his vows in Cambodia in the late 1970s. The communist war on religion wracked Cuba for a half century, a nation not even one hundred miles off America’s shore. The battle remains very much alive, obviously, in China, where Christians worship in underground churches, or in jail cells; because China is religiously unfree, one of every five people in the world are spiritually shackled. And the onslaught rages on in the prison-state of North Korea, once known as the “Jerusalem of the East.”

Whether the totalitarian leader was Fidel Castro or Pol Pot or Joe Stalin, the sentiment was the same. Wherever they went, from East to West, from Africa to Asia, from Phnom Penh to St. Petersburg, communists shared one goal: the annihilation of religion. Communists quibbled over the details of how to implement Marx’s vision, but they were unanimous in one thing: religion was the enemy, a rival to Marxist mind control, and it had to be vanquished regardless of costs and difficulties.³¹⁰

This atheism was integral to the revolution. Even those communists unable to secure political power—and thus lacking the ability to persecute believers—still did their best to persecute the teachings of organized religion and ridicule the idea of the existence of God. In fact, even in America, it was no surprise to stroll by a city newsstand in the mid-twentieth century and catch bold front-page headlines like this in the *Daily Worker*, the communist organ published by CPUSA: “THERE IS NO GOD.”³¹¹ Communists were proud of their atheism, always militant and never shy.

The fact that communists devoted so much time and effort to anti-religion reflects that remarkable devotion—again, an almost religious-like devotion—to the goal of eliminating religious faith. It also attested to the communist conviction that religion truly was incompatible with Marxism-Leninism. Nothing else seemed to elicit such howls and hisses from Karl Marx’s disciples.

Hell on Earth: the Richard Wurmbrand Experience

Again, so many such examples could be cited. This chapter will conclude with some frightening images from the vicious communist state that was Romania.

Richard Wurmbrand was a pastor who endured fourteen years of hell in a Romanian prison. He detailed some of the unspeakable cruelty he witnessed in testimony before the US Congress and in his widely read *Tortured for Christ*, first published in 1967. “Thousands of believers from churches of all denominations were sent to prison at that time,” remembered Wurmbrand. “Not only were clergymen put in jail, but also simple peasants, young boys and girls who witnessed for their faith. The prisons were full, and in Romania, as in all communist countries, to be in prison means to be tortured.” He recalled the example of one pastor:

A pastor by the name of Florescu was tortured with red-hot iron pokers and with knives. He was beaten very badly. Then starving rats were driven into his cell through a large pipe. He could not sleep because he had to defend himself all the time. If he rested a moment, the rats would attack him.

He was forced to stand for two weeks, day and night. ... Eventually, they brought his fourteen-year-old son to the prison and began to whip the boy in front of his father, saying that they would continue to beat him until the pastor said what they wished him to say. The poor man was half mad. He bore it as long as he could, then he cried to his son, “Alexander, I must say what they want! I can’t bear your beating anymore!” The son answered, “Father, don’t do me the injustice of having a traitor as a parent. Withstand! If they kill me, I will die with the words, ‘Jesus and my fatherland’.” The communists, enraged, fell upon the child and beat him to death, with blood spattered over the walls of the cell. He died praising God. Our dear brother Florescu was never the same after seeing this.³¹²

Wurmbrand’s captors carved him in a dozen different parts of his body. They burned eighteen holes in him.

“What the communists have done to Christians surpasses ... human understanding,” wrote Wurmbrand. He said that communist torturers often told him, “There is no God, no hereafter, no punishment for evil. We can do

what we wish.” Wurmbrand described crucifixion at the hands of communists. Christians would be tied to crosses for four days and nights:

The crosses were placed on the floor and hundreds of prisoners had to fulfill their bodily necessities over the faces and bodies of the crucified ones. Then the crosses were erected again and the communists jeered and mocked: “Look at your Christ! How beautiful he is! What fragrance he brings from heaven!”... After being driven nearly insane with tortures, a priest was forced to consecrate human excrement and urine and give Holy Communion to Christians in this form. This happened in the Romanian prison of Pitesti. I asked the priest afterward why he did not prefer to die rather than participate in this mockery. He answered, “Don’t judge me, please! I have suffered more than Christ!” All the biblical descriptions of hell and the pains of Dante’s *Inferno* are nothing in comparison with the tortures in communist prisons.

This is only a very small part of what happened on one Sunday and on many other Sundays in the prison of Pitesti. Other things simply cannot be told. My heart would fail if I should tell them again and again. They are too terrible and obscene to put in writing.

It was not an unusual Sunday at the Pitesti prison, a frightening house of horrors that even the imaginative Dante Alighieri could not have conceived.

The Hell That Was Pitesti

What Wurmbrand described from the prison of Pitesti is just a small, bitter taste of an awful place filled with tales of depravity. The evils that prowled about that political penitentiary and brainwashing/reeducation center in the city of Pitesti, located on the Arges River in Romania, beginning in 1949 and continuing among several years and perhaps thousands of inmates, have been acknowledged in the communist world (and noted by the likes of Alexander Solzhenitsyn) but have not received the attention they should in the West. A website (with English translation) has been created and devoted to the subject, appropriately titled “The Genocide of the Souls—The Pitesti Experiment.” The website, an extension of an accompanying film project, is maintained by Romanian filmmakers Sorin Iliesiu and Doru Lucian Iliesiu, partnering with the renowned French scholar Stephane Courtois, editor of the Harvard University Press classic *The Black Book of Communism*.³¹³

The site captures some of the truly ghastly testimonies that have been preserved largely in Eastern European literature. Young religious students in particular were tortured, and often in ways that mocked or sought to commit great sacrilege against their Christian faith. Note that the sources below come from book accounts with titles like *The Devil’s Mill* and *The Hell of Pitesti*.³¹⁴ Readers beware—this is very sick stuff:

“The delirious imagination of Turcanu [the chief torturer at Pitesti] was unleashed above all when he was dealing with students who believed in God and who strove not to renounce their belief. Thus, some were baptized each morning: their heads plunged into a bucket of urine and fecal matter, while the others around chanted the ritual of baptism. This would last until the contents of the bucket started to bubble. When the recalcitrant prisoner was on the point of drowning, he would be pulled up, given a short respite in which to breathe, then submerged once more.”³¹⁵

“In the so-called act of depersonalization, the students were forced, under torture, permanent and unimaginable torture, to betray all they held dear: God, their own parents, brothers, sisters and friends. They were constrained to drink urine and to eat feces! The human being was thereby annihilated. Disgusted at his weakness, he would never be able to recover himself before his own conscience. The pain was beyond the power of human endurance.”³¹⁶

“Then they undressed me. ... What followed is indescribable ... beatings on the head to induce stupefaction; beatings in the face, for disfigurement; thousands of blows to the back, below the ribs, in the plexus, on the soles of the feet. Dozens of faints and then all over again, for hours on end, and the eye at the peep hole always watching, always watching. They shattered my ribs, lungs, liver, kicking my bones, my kidneys with shod feet.”³¹⁷

“When the victim was a theology student or a person with a certain religious feeling, he was made to genuflect to the bare bottom of one of the ‘re-educated,’ to call that bottom an icon and to kiss it. He would have to label the Holy Virgin ‘the great whore’ and Jesus Christ ‘the great idiot crucified on the cross.’ If it was known that the victim loved his parents, Turcanu would provoke him thus: Tell me, X, how did you sleep with your mother? or, Tell me how you caught your father raping your sister? The victim, after enduring the purgatory of ‘re-education,’ was never abandoned, but was also drawn into the caste of executioners.”³¹⁸

“Performances on religious subjects, black masses staged at Easter or Christmas, horrified the detainees. On such occasions, it was the theology students who were to suffer the most, dressed up as ‘Christs,’ clothed in cassocks smeared with excrement. They were made to take ‘communion’ with urine and feces, and instead of the Cross, a phallus was fashioned of soap, which all the others were made to kiss. Alongside them hymns were sung with scabrous words, in which the commonplaces were insults against Christ and the Virgin Mary. Sometimes the detainees would be stripped naked.”³¹⁹

“Sexual plays also performed at the orders of Turcanu, naturally. On Good Friday, he shared out the roles: the ‘ass’ is fellated by ‘Mary Magdalene,’ ‘Joseph’ sodomizes the ‘ass,’ which in its turn stands with its muzzle in the lap of the ‘Virgin Mary whore,’ concomitantly sodomized by ‘Jesus.’ The re-educated, headed by Turcanu, displayed a diabolical pleasure in mocking the faithful, nicknamed ‘mystics.’ Such scenes had a terrible effect on the victims, who as a rule found their only solace in faith. However, after participating in the black masses, their entire faith was shaken to its foundations.”³²⁰

“You were made to tug each other’s genitals or one of them would put his penis in your mouth; if you soiled yourself during beatings you were made to eat your own feces and to lick the dirtied long-johns or to eat another’s feces from your own mess tin, without being allowed to wash it after that; you were made to kiss each other’s bottoms; you were made to urinate in each other’s mouths; when you begged for water, you would be given urine from the bucket

or they would urinate in your mouth, or others would spit in your mouth; you were made to spit in each other's bottoms and then lick it up; they would wipe a stick smeared in feces ... on your mouth and in your mouth; you were made to stick your finger up your bottom and then suck it.”³²¹

“With indescribable fury they began to hit him, with fists, cudgels and feet. And to toss him from one to another, until the bloodied wretch fell almost senseless and could no longer rise. After they had given him a few more kicks to the head, two of them picked him up and threw him on the bunk, making him sit with his hands in his pockets and his head bowed, according to the order. Then another followed, then another, as though in a devilish ring dance intended to annihilate the last speck of physical and moral resistance of those who entered into their rabid game.”³²²

These descriptions speak for themselves. No macabre screenwriter or slasher-film master would dare go this far.

Betrayal of God was the order of the day, as was sacrilege in the name of Jesus, “the great idiot crucified,” and the Blessed Mother, “the great whore.” Holy days were special moments for obscenity and blasphemy. And there were black masses. Of course, there were black masses.

Who would say that the devil wasn't present there at Pitesti?

CHAPTER 6

“SATANIC SCOURGE”

THE CHURCH ON ATHEISTIC COMMUNISM

Alexander Yakovlev was Mikhail Gorbachev's chief aide and reformer. He was assigned the grisly task of looking into the subject of communist crimes more closely than any other Kremlin official. After the collapse of the USSR, he was given access to Communist Party archives as head of modern Russia's Presidential Commission for the Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression. He was particularly struck by the “merciless mass terror” against the religious—so intense and insidious that Yakovlev, in his book published by Yale University Press, used words like “infernal” and “evil” and even “demonic” to describe the force that had swept through his “sinful land.”³²³

As Yakovlev put it, the USSR had followed a Marxist-Leninist social system that “preaches the demonic religion of evil.” What Marxism-Leninism had wrought against religious faith was “infinitely vile.” This demanded repentance “of our sins and errors” and a collective kneeling “before the graves of the millions of people who were shot or who died of hunger.” Communist officials should repent for the “gulag harvest of crosses” produced in this “biggest cemetery on earth” otherwise known as the Soviet Union.³²⁴

This is not language typical of a leading scholarly academic press, but Yakovlev could not avoid it. It was also not language typical of a onetime

top Soviet official. And Alexander Yakovlev, for the record, was not known to have been religious. Nonetheless, free to speak the truth at last, Yakovlev did not hold back. The evil he saw was undeniable, and words like “infernal” and “diabolical” struck him as the best description of what had transpired in the USSR. Such was the inescapable conclusion of so many witnesses to communism.

“Dark Design”

The Roman Catholic Church figured prominently among those leveling precisely such charges against communism. From the very outset, well before Bolshevism seized Russia, no institution foresaw the scourge of atheistic communism like the institutional Roman Catholic Church.

Quite remarkably, the Church’s scathing condemnation of communism preceded even the publication of the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848. A preemptive strike was delivered two years earlier by Pope Pius IX in 1846, as Karl Marx conspired under the shadow of St. Michael the Archangel in Brussels toiling at his revolutionary catechism.

In November 1846, Pope Pius IX released *Qui Pluribus*, affirming that communism is “absolutely contrary to the natural law itself” and if adopted would “utterly destroy the rights, property, and possessions of all men, and even society itself.” If ever it seemed a man had held a crystal ball ... Few statements were so unerringly predictive of what was to come.

Qui Pluribus stated that communism was a “dark design” of “men in the clothing of sheep, while inwardly ravening wolves.” “After taking their captives gently, they mildly bind them, and then kill them in secret,” this encyclical somehow knew, or foreknew. “They make men fly in terror from all practice of religion, and they cut down and dismember the sheep of the Lord.” The writings of communists, Pius IX stated, teach “sinning” and “widespread disgusting infection.” They are “filled with deceit and cunning” and “spread pestilential doctrines everywhere and deprave the minds especially of the imprudent, occasioning great losses for religion.”

Qui Pluribus continued, “As a result of this filthy medley of errors ... We see ... morals deteriorated, Christ’s most holy religion despised, the majesty of divine worship rejected, the power of this Apostolic See plundered, the authority of the Church attacked and reduced to base slavery, the rights of bishops trampled on, the sanctity of marriage infringed.”³²⁵

Somehow, this pope and his Magisterium had even foreseen that marriage would be infringed upon by communists. Again, this was two years before Marx and Engels published their opus.

In 1849, one year after the *Manifesto* was published, Pius IX issued another encyclical, *Nostis Et Nobiscum*, which referred to both socialism and communism as “wicked theories,” “perverted theories,” “perverted teachings,” and “pernicious fictions.” They were linked together throughout the encyclical.

For the Church and its shepherds, this was just the start of a never-ending response to communism and its ugly stepsister, socialism. (In strict Marxist-Leninist theory, socialism is a mere transitional step on the way to full communism. More on this in a moment.)

On December 28, 1878, Pius IX’s successor, Pope Leo XIII, followed with *Quod Apostolici Muneris* (On Socialism), which defined communism as “the fatal plague which insinuates itself into the very marrow of human society only to bring about its ruin.” He stated, “We speak of that sect of men who, under various and almost barbarous names, are called socialists, communists, or nihilists, and who, spread over all the world, and bound together by a wicked confederacy, no longer seek the shelter of secret meetings, but, openly and boldly marching forth in the light of day, strive to bring what they have long been planning—the overthrow of all civil society.” These men “leave nothing untouched.” These men “debase the natural union of man and woman, held sacred even among barbarous peoples; and its bond, by which the family is chiefly held together. ... Doctrines of socialism strive almost completely to dissolve this union.”

More such pronouncements followed from the Magisterium in 1924, 1928, 1930 (particularly the February 1930 statement *The Soviet Campaign Against God*), another in 1931, two in 1932, another in 1933, with the harshest still yet to come in March 1937.

Among these, 1931 saw Pope Pius XI issue his seminal *Quadragesimo Anno*. Few passages in *Quadragesimo Anno* put it as bluntly as this one (section 120): “Religious socialism, Christian socialism, are contradictory terms; no one can be at the same time a good Catholic and a true socialist.”

To repeat: one cannot be a true socialist and a good Catholic.

And then came *Divini Redemptoris*. Released in March 1937, during Stalin’s Great Terror, this formal Roman Catholic Church encyclical may

well be the most damning official declaration ever issued against communism. In this document, Pope Pius XI, who held the chair of St. Peter from February 1922 to February 1939, escalated the papal tradition of opposing communism, a mantle that would be picked up by (and then some) his successor, Eugenio Pacelli, Pope Pius XII, who served from March 1939 to October 1958, and who was such a formidable enemy of Soviet communism that Stalin and his goons labeled him “Hitler’s Pope.”³²⁶

Divini Redemptoris called communism “pernicious,” “Godless,” “by its nature anti-religious,” a form of “perversity,” a “fury,” “poison,” an “extreme danger,” a “deluge which threatens the world,” a “collectivistic terrorism ... replete with hate,” and a “plague” that leads to “catastrophe.” It constituted a form of “class-warfare which causes rivers of blood to flow,” a “savage barbarity.” Marxists were “the powers of darkness,” orchestrating a battle against “the very idea of Divinity.” Communism was a “satanic scourge” that “conceals in itself a false messianic idea.”

“The evil we must combat,” said the encyclical, “is at its origin primarily an evil of the spiritual order. From this polluted source the monstrous emanations of the communistic system flow with satanic logic.” The encyclical even underscored communism’s attack on marriage, family, motherhood, education, parents.

In *Divini Redemptoris*, the Church made clear that the notion of a “Christian Marxist” was an oxymoron. In the dialectical and historical materialism advocated by Marx, “there is no room for the idea of God.” The document was unambiguous: communism was a “truly diabolical” instrument of Satan and his “sons of darkness,” a false promise, a “convulsion,” yet one more “sad legacy” of the fall of man.

1949 Papal Decree Against Communism

Still another striking example of the Church’s rejection of communism was Pope Pius XII’s historic July 1949 *Decree Against Communism*. Issued from the Holy Office, it dealt explicitly with the matter of excommunication of communists. The decree is very brief and very simple. It presented four basic questions with four clear answers:

1. Is it licit to join or show favor to Communist parties? Response: **No.**

2. Is it licit to publish, distribute, or read publications that support Communist doctrine or activity, or to write for them? Response: **No.**
3. May Christians who knowingly and freely commit the acts in parts 1 and 2 be given the sacraments? Response: **No.**
4. Do Christians who profess, defend or promote materialistic Communist doctrine incur the penalty of excommunication as apostates from the Christian faith, with the penalty reserved so that it may only be lifted by the Holy See? Response: **Yes.**³²⁷

Yes, the Roman Catholic Church was so against communism, and against its members joining the Communist Party or promoting communist doctrine, that the pope himself stated that Catholics would incur the penalty of excommunication as apostates from the faith if they were to do so.

Vatican II on Christians “Infected” with Communism

Many Catholics rightly suspect that this toughness toward communism softened, at least rhetorically, during Vatican II (1962–65). Still, even Vatican II acknowledged the dangers of and condemned communism, albeit (quite disappointingly) in documents that went unpublished.³²⁸ Reading those statements is worthwhile for discerning the ongoing consistency within the Church in confronting this lethal ideology so threatening to faith and freedom.

There were three documents—technically considered “preparatory schemas”—written and approved by the “General Session” of the Second Vatican Council from February to April 1962. I will here quote only a few sections to provide a sense of the gist of the statements. The documents were poignant philosophical statements on communism, but still more striking for the practical steps they carefully outlined for the Church to take in countering the ideology. As stated by one source who translated the schemas, “These documents represented a plan to launch a global offensive against communism.” They clearly did.³²⁹

The first of the three documents, titled “On the Care of Souls With Regard to Christians Infected With Communism,” opened by identifying “atheistic communism” as a “menace” threatening the “doctrine and activity of the Church,” with a specific purpose “to radically overturn the social order and to subvert the foundations of Christian civilization.” It stated that

communism “offers a false kind of redemption,” and is pervaded, “in a pseudo-mystical way, with a certain false idea of justice, equality and fraternity for all in the administration of their needs and labors, for the purpose of inflaming the masses by enticing them with deceitful promises, by which they are aroused as if by a virulent contagion.” Communism served as “a false religion without God,” as it sought to abolish the very notion of an “eternal Divinity and the hope of another life.” Atheistic communism sought to “bring about a new political order,” an association of men “that expels God from the earth,” and yet, “like a new gospel and like a form of salvific redemption, preaches its message to all of humanity.”

The language in that opening preamble set the tone for the document, which then went on to make the crucial point that “the Church, as the Mystical Body of Christ,” has a moral-spiritual-evangelical duty to oppose communism rather than engage in “merely political or economic anticommunism.” This is “a spiritual struggle against atheistic communism,” which the document called an “invention so full of errors and delusions.”

But what made this document (to repeat, unpublished) so unique from all previous Church statements on communism were the concrete steps—the specific plan of action—that it laid out in thirteen steps, several of them with additional sub-steps. Among them were these notable suggestions:

6. For this purpose, students are to be educated in seminaries and likewise priests in particular courses are to be instructed regarding the doctrines of communism itself, of the truths of the faith it attacks, and of the most apt pastoral method for defending the faith.

7. The bishops in the National Conferences should promote a firm and constant action against the errors of the communists through the use of experts, and likewise should ensure that in each province or nation there should be a specified group of men who, as true experts in communist doctrine, zealously combat the errors of the same doctrine with meticulous care.

8. Because pastoral activity should be addressed to all men, not excluding militant communists, the bishops should ensure that in each province or nation a select group of priests and laity be designated, men who are outstanding in knowledge or reputation, and particularly in the zeal for their apostolate, who strive to win for Christ those who

are followers of communism or who are infected by its erroneous doctrines....

10. There is a need for an influx of workers' guilds and a common association of laborers for the purpose of counteracting or eliminating the influx of atheistic communism among simpler souls, who have a poor understanding of the nature of communism and do not support it strongly, although they might vote in favor of communism for economic reasons.

We will see in the pages ahead that certain priests and bishops took up these charges (most conspicuously, Fulton Sheen). And as to point 6, there was concern that communists had their eyes on seminaries.

Then came these eye-openers, subsets of step 11, recommending that certain Catholics (churchmen among them) be silenced, severely admonished, or even hit with penalties for succumbing to these pernicious "progressive" doctrines:

§ 7. Catholics who, infected by "progressive" doctrines and zealous for revolution, or because of a false so-called "idealism," or a wavering judgment, or an erroneous notion of charity, or because of fear of Soviet power and a foolish shame of the judgment of man, impede action against atheistic communism, should be publicly silenced by ecclesiastical authority. Priests delinquent in this regard are to be severely admonished, and, if the case so merits, inflicted with penalties.

§ 8. Those, however, who, whether they are bishops or priests or laity, act to counter atheistic communism in a healthy way, are to be lauded and assisted and, if it is necessary, defended.

This was in keeping with the late Pius XII's decree on communism. The Church also recommended these two final concrete steps:

12. An international commission of bishops and of lay experts should be instituted, which, under the leadership of the Holy See, has the task of overseeing and supporting all of those who seek to defend and liberate mankind from the errors of atheism and communism.

13. It will be the principal duty of this international commission to promote and coordinate the studies, works, ordinances, and laws that debilitate communism and shatter its audacity.

Without a doubt, this was bold and daring. The text of the document closed by stating in italics, "*Text definitively approved in the General Session held on the days of February 5-13, 1962.*"

Unfortunately, these documents were not published, very likely in part because they were obstructed and undermined by Church liberals who

found them too provocative and too contrary to the new spirit they wanted to fashion from Vatican II. Pope Paul VI, who closed out Vatican II, years later would warn that the “smoke of Satan” had entered the Church. One wonders if the blocking of these documents were early signals of just that. No doubt, these documents remain notable for how they reflected ongoing Church teaching, but it seems equally notable (and lamentable) that the documents went unpublished.

The “Cunning” “Contagion” of Communism

The second Vatican II document “On the Care of Souls and Communism” (title similar to the first document, albeit abbreviated) reiterated much of the first document. Even then, the language is excellent and worth quoting. It started with this:

There are a large number of people in many nations who, although they were not born into ignoble families and they were even baptized and educated in the Catholic Church, are enticed by communism, enlist in communist organizations, and vote for communists in political and administrative elections. Many of them, indeed, do not adhere to communist philosophical doctrines in their hearts, and the only basis of their merely practical support for the communist cause, or at least the principal one, is that they regard it as an effective way to bring about the perfect establishment of social justice, and, in fact, for obtaining a better salary or wage for less work, for receiving an equal part of the division and distribution of wealth and material goods, and for living a more comfortable and easier life. However, those who favor communism only for economic convenience are mistaken.

The document cautioned against the “contagion of communism” employing its “cunning methods for deceiving the incautious.” This was a trenchant warning of the timeless problem of dupes, of people (especially on the “social justice” religious left) being suckered by communists operating with slick slogans or various tricks and tools to manipulate the gullible.

And in one of maybe the most farseeing passages in the three Vatican II schemas, this second document warned of communist penetration of the universities: “It is to be strongly recommended that in universities and in other institutions of higher education of the sciences and arts, particular groups or associations be instituted for professors or students to ensure that they may not only give a public and clear testimony regarding the Christian faith by their truly Christian beliefs and manner of life, but also so they might expressly and efficaciously act to frustrate, or at least restrain, the nefarious work that is carried out hotly and bitterly in the aforementioned schools by so-called communist cells.”

The third document, titled “On the Apostolate of the Laity in Environments Imbued With Materialism, Particularly Marxism,” is the shortest of the three preparatory schemas. Nonetheless, it likewise had sharp words regarding the “open and militant atheism” of “so-called ‘Marxism’” and the “exceedingly grave and universal danger” it posed. Marxism constituted “the most grave form of materialism and the one most hostile towards the Christian faith.” The document also powerfully noted (in the endnotes) that while communism is an explicitly atheistic ideology that “combats all forms of religions whatsoever,” which it declares to be “the opiate of the people,” and that “it especially opposes the Roman Catholic Church,” the ironic reality is that communism itself “is a pseudo-religion, and indeed an eschatological one.” The ideology promotes an end-times/utopian-like vision of heaven on earth.

Communism, concluded Vatican II, had a “messianic mission,” by which the glistening new “collectivity” of the blessed “masses” would be the new “redeemer of mankind.” And this “religion defends its dogmatic Marxism-Leninism, condemns heretics and excommunicates schismatics.”

Clearly, even the new spirit pervading Vatican II could not escape notice of the unclean spirit of communism. Men inside the Church remained fully aware of the evils that needed to be exorcised.

“Body of the Anti-Christ”

Such condemnations of communism would continue in further statements by many Catholic priests, bishops, and popes. From the shores of America, few were as vocal and influential as Fulton Sheen.

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen (1895–1979) was one of the most prominent Americans of the twentieth century. He was extraordinarily popular not just because of his sermons and his writings but through his powerful radio broadcasts and highly watched television show, *Life Is Worth Living*. Sheen could not be missed, and neither could his blistering attacks against communism. (He can still be seen today, particularly on EWTN television, the global Catholic network.)

Sheen noted that whereas Karl Marx called religion “the sigh of the oppressed creature,” Sheen saw *communism* as the sigh of the oppressed creature. In a 1936 Lenten sermon at St. Patrick’s Cathedral in New York,

Sheen asked, “Why can’t the modern mind see there is nothing new in communism?” He called it “a groan of despair.”³³⁰

In another Lenten message, Sheen called the USSR “the most anti-Christ nation on the face of the earth.” He told the assembled that it was fitting that Soviet communism’s emblem was “a rotted corpse, the body of Lenin—a perfect symbol of that to which all communism must lead us all, unto dust, unto dissolution, unto death.”³³¹

In 1948, Sheen wrote *Communism and the Conscience of West*, a bestseller. “The truth on the subject is that communism and atheism are intrinsically related and that one cannot be a good Communist without being an atheist and every atheist is a potential Communist,” said Sheen. He quoted Marx: “Communism begins where atheism begins.” And yet, ironically, said Sheen, it was *communism*, rather than religion, that was an opiate of the masses. Soviet communism adhered to the “preaching of Lenin,” the “apostles of Marx,” and treated Stalin like a god.

In his 1954 book *The Church, Communism and Democracy*, Sheen wrote that communism was inspired not by the spirit of Christ “but by the spirit of the serpent. ... The Mystical Body of the Anti-Christ.” He said, “They have thrown down the gauntlet to the world. The voice is either brotherhood in Christ or comradeship in anti-Christ.” Sheen explained, “In order to understand the communists’ idea of truth, we have to substitute the philosophy of communism for God; in other words, the ultimate origin of truth is [found] in their party.” He added that “Marx was not first a Communist and then an atheist. He was first an atheist, then a Communist. Communism was merely the political expression of his atheism. As he hated God, so would he hate those who would own property.”³³²

Sheen contrasted the redemptive suffering of Christ to the non-redemptive suffering of Marx and communist philosophy. “Christianity,” writes Sheen, “comes to optimism through pessimism; to a resurrection through a passion, and to a crown of glory through a crown of thorns; to the glory of Easter Sunday through the ignominy of a Good Friday.” Tying that to the suffering wrought by Soviet communism, Sheen advised that the Russian people—for whom, he rightly said, “atheism is not natural”—take heart that Christ’s tomb is empty, while Lenin’s tomb is not.

Sheen said that communists had failed to convince the world that there is no God. Rather, he quipped, they had succeeded only in convincing the

world that there is a devil.³³³

That was Fulton Sheen, who was steadfast and omnipresent in countering communism. Of course, these statements are a mere snippet of Sheen's admonitions. Truly, this book could be filled with remarks from Sheen. And all along, Sheen had the backing of a universal Church and its popes behind him.

Among popes, numerous formal statements have already been cited here, and so many personal assessments could be quoted from Pope John Paul II alone, the ultimate battler against twentieth-century communism. We could even look to appraisals from popes of the modern day—that is, our own twenty-first century.

Pope Benedict XVI (2005–13), born Joseph Ratzinger in Germany, is one of the great intellects in the Roman Catholic Church and wider Christian church. His writings on topics from Jesus of Nazareth to the crisis of the Western world are insightful and memorable, warning of everything from a “dictatorship of relativism” to the hazards of a society that exalts a “confused ideology of freedom.”

But Pope Benedict also had warned his flock about the pitfalls of Marxism. “Together with the victory of the revolution,” wrote Benedict in his November 2007 encyclical *Spe Salvi (In Hope We Are Saved)*, “Marx’s fundamental error also became evident. He showed precisely how to overthrow the existing order, but he did not say how matters should proceed thereafter. He simply presumed that with the expropriation of the ruling class, with the fall of political power and the socialization of means of production, the new Jerusalem would be realized.”

Once the existed order was overthrown, noted Benedict, Marx figured that “all contradictions would be resolved, man and the world would finally sort themselves out. Then everything would be able to proceed by itself along the right path.” Marx, averred Pope Benedict XVI, had neglected to “work out how this new world would be organized—which should, of course, have been unnecessary.” It would have been unnecessary to Marx because utopia would have inevitably swept in and massaged all those inconvenient details.

On those details, Marx was silent. He need not talk, or write, about what came next, because it would simply ... well, come. It would come.

“His silence on this matter follows logically from his chosen approach,” Pope Benedict XVI said of Marx. “His error lay deeper. He forgot that man always remains man. He forgot man and he forgot man’s freedom. He forgot that freedom always remains also freedom for evil.”

That freedom for evil would be exercised by men like Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Bukharin, Mao, Pol Pot, the Kims, Che, Castro.

Said Benedict of Marx, “He thought that once the economy had been put right, everything would automatically be put right. His real error is materialism: man, in fact, is not merely the product of economic conditions, and it is not possible to redeem him purely from the outside by creating a favorable economic environment.”

In other words, man does not live on bread alone—as Jesus Christ reminded Satan.

And on Lenin, too, Pope Benedict XVI had something to say, seeing in the Bolshevik godfather the same fatal assumption, banking on Marx for something that had never been deposited: “Thus, having accomplished the revolution, Lenin must have realized that the writings of the master gave no indication as to how to proceed. True, Marx had spoken of the interim phase of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a necessity which in time would automatically become redundant. This ‘intermediate phase’ we know all too well, and we also know how it then developed, not ushering in a perfect world, but leaving behind a trail of appalling destruction.”

That it did.

Such was the previous pontiff, Pope Benedict XVI.

And for the record, updating this treatment to today’s pontiff, it should be noted that even Pope Francis, often criticized by conservatives as a “Marxist,” has stated emphatically, “The Marxist ideology is wrong.”³³⁴

Rejecting Socialism

It is worth pausing to address the question of “socialism.” Today, one often hears certain people object, “Well, I’m not a communist; I’m a socialist,” or a “I’m a democratic socialist.”

Alas, what is socialism? What is *democratic socialism*? How are they different from communism? Many of those rallying to the flag have the same questions.³³⁵ Without getting into a protracted analysis of nuances, a

few clarifications are in order and relevant to this discussion and to discourse today.

For starters, Vladimir Lenin and Leon Trotsky and Joseph Stalin and their fellow communist totalitarians established a “Union of Soviet *Socialist* Republics.” It was at the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, beginning in Brussels and ending in London, traversing a period of three weeks from July to August 1903, that Lenin changed the name of his and Trotsky’s and Stalin’s party from the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party to what would eventually become the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It was there that Lenin and his cadre became the Bolsheviks (splitting into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks). The Bolsheviks were first social democrats.³³⁶ Here in the United States, leading communists of the day, such as William Z. Foster and Ben Gitlow and Bertram Wolfe, to name just three, were leaders in the American Socialist Party in the first decade of the twentieth century before they helped launch the American Communist Party in the second decade of the twentieth century. Foster and Gitlow will be detailed at length later. Wolfe, it should be noted here, joined them in turning the American Socialist Party into the American Communist Party, and likewise became a founding delegate of the American Communist Party to the Soviet Comintern in Moscow. Wolfe correctly said of Lenin and social democrats, “Lenin began his career as a Social Democrat.”³³⁷

Gitlow and Wolfe took the natural step in the Marxist evolutionary process, moving from socialism to communism.

Modern self-identified “socialists” in America or Western Europe recoil at any suggested similarity to or sympathy with Soviet socialism—or to Nazi socialism. (“Nazi” is actually an acronym for National *Socialist* German Workers’ Party.) They indeed have committed no acts of violence anywhere near approaching those orchestrated by such tyrants. Nonetheless, socialists generally, in America and the wider West, do have in common with the Soviets and the Nazis the general goal of government ownership of the means of production in some form. Socialists all share that objective. The famous Clause IV of the 1918 British Labour Party manifesto/platform (repudiated in 1995 by Labour Party leader Tony Blair) called for “the most equitable distribution” based on “the common ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange.” That is a central tenet of socialist thought. When curious seekers search for the word at [Merriam-](#)

[Webster.com](#), they will discover precisely that standard definition. “Socialism,” states Merriam-Webster, is “government ownership of the means of production.”

Sometimes the best approach to try to define a term is to go directly to the source—that is, to the advocates themselves.

To that end, the World Socialist Party of the United States declares its overriding “object” as this: “The establishment of a system of society based on the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of society as a whole.” More than that, it sees this object as part of a global movement. “The WSP forms part of the world socialist movement,” states the group’s mission statement. “Our only goal is to educate people to the urgent need we all have of eliminating wage-labor and capital now in favor of communist-based free access and self-determination of needs. We call this ‘common ownership,’ but other terms we regard as synonymous are communism and socialism.”

This explanation comes right from WSP’s website and literature. The group’s logo depicts the globe wrapped in a banner that declares “UNITE FOR SOCIALISM!” under the famous Marxist phrase “WORKERS OF THE WORLD” and above the Marxist phrase “YOU HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE BUT YOUR CHAINS.”

Here we see that these socialists are communists, as they themselves concede. The World Socialist Party regards the two as synonymous. It is not alone in that respect, and never has been. It sees socialism as the crucial final step to communism, which, according to Marxist theory, it is.

In strict Marxist theory, socialism has that very specific purpose and definition; it is a waystation along the path to a full communist *utopia*. History, according to Marxist-dialectic thought, would pass through a series of planes or stages, from feudalism to capitalism to socialism to communism. Each successive plane or stage would be a higher step in the evolutionary process toward a “workers’ paradise” or glorious “classless society.”

In probably his most revealing work, *The State and Revolution*, Lenin, in his chapter titled “The Transition from Capitalism to Communism,” began with a quote from Marx: “Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state

can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.”³³⁸ Lenin also quoted Engels: “According to Engels, the bourgeois state does not ‘wither away,’ but is ‘abolished’ by the proletariat in the course of the revolution. What withers away after this revolution is the proletarian state or semistate. ... In speaking of the state ‘withering away,’ and the even more graphic and colorful ‘dying down of itself,’ Engels refers quite clearly and definitely to the period after ‘the state has taken possession of the means of production in the name of the whole of society,’ that is, after the socialist revolution.”

The socialist revolution opens the door to the eventual consummation of the communist revolution.

Returning to the timeline and theme of this book, socialism (the blood brother of communism) began pursuing a militantly atheistic agenda from the outset, and the Catholic Church certainly noticed. Let us consider again some of the Catholic Church’s significant encyclicals.

As noted earlier, in his 1849 encyclical *Nostis Et Nobiscum*, Pope Pius IX called both socialism and communism “wicked theories,” “perverted theories,” “perverted teachings,” and “pernicious fictions.” They were linked together throughout the encyclical. He spoke of a “most iniquitous plot ... to drive people to overthrow the entire order of human affairs and to draw them over to the wicked theories of this Socialism and Communism, by confusing them with perverted teachings.”

In his second encyclical, *Quod Apostolici Muneris* (On Socialism), issued December 28, 1878, Pope Leo XIII correctly lumped socialists and communists together; they formed a “wicked confederacy.” He wrote, “We speak of that sect of men who, under various and almost barbarous names, are called socialists, communists, or nihilists, and who, spread over all the world, and bound together by a wicked confederacy, no longer seek the shelter of secret meetings, but, openly and boldly marching forth in the light of day, strive to bring what they have long been planning—the overthrow of all civil society.” He said, “They leave nothing untouched.” Not only do they attack the right of property, but they “debase the natural union of man and woman, held sacred even among barbarous peoples; and its bond, by which the family is chiefly held together. ... Doctrines of socialism strive almost completely to dissolve this union.”

Quod Apostolici Muneris spoke of the “pest of socialism,” the “plague of socialism,” the “evil growth of socialism,” warned of the “recruits of

socialism,” and accused socialists of “stealing the very Gospel itself with a view to deceive more easily the unwary.” These socialists “distort it [the Gospel] so as to suit their own purposes.”

This is just one of many encyclicals in which Leo XIII blasted socialism and communism. They range from the encyclicals *Diuturnum* (June 29, 1881), to *Humanum Genus* (April 20, 1884), *Libertas Praestantissimum* (June 20, 1888), and *Graves de Communi Re* (January 18, 1901). Socialists were “wicked,” “seditious,” “insidious,” and plotted to bring about the “ruin” of society.

Of course, in May 1891 Leo XIII would issue *Rerum Novarum*. This classic is a favorite of many Catholics, but many liberal admirers of it seem to forget its staunch rejection of socialism. Consider this passage (sections 4–5):

To remedy these wrongs the socialists, working on the poor man’s envy of the rich, are striving to do away with private property, and contend that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies. They hold that by thus transferring property from private individuals to the community, the present mischievous state of things will be set to rights, inasmuch as each citizen will then get his fair share of whatever there is to enjoy. But their contentions are so clearly powerless to end the controversy that were they carried into effect the working man himself would be among the first to suffer. They are, moreover, emphatically unjust, for they would rob the lawful possessor, distort the functions of the State, and create utter confusion in the community. ... Socialists, therefore, by endeavoring to transfer the possessions of individuals to the community at large, strike at the interests of every wage-earner, since they would deprive him of the liberty of disposing of his wages, and thereby of all hope and possibility of increasing his resources and of bettering his condition in life.

Rerum Novarum notes that socialists “strive against nature in vain.” They even undermine the family: “The socialists, therefore, in setting aside the parent and setting up a State supervision, act against natural justice, and destroy the structure of the home” (no. 14). *Rerum Novarum* added, “Hence, it is clear that the main tenet of socialism, community of goods, must be utterly rejected, since it only injures those whom it would seem meant to benefit, is directly contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonweal” (no. 15).

Rerum Novarum became the basis for another classic, the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, which was released forty years later, in May 1891.

Recall that section 120 of *Quadragesimo Anno* states bluntly, “Religious socialism, Christian socialism, are contradictory terms; no one can be at the same time a good Catholic and a true socialist.”

There are some fifty references to socialism in *Quadragesimo Anno*. Section fifty-five speaks of “the Socialists who hold that whatever serves to produce goods ought to be transferred to the State, or, as they say ‘socialized.’” That ambition is “all the more dangerous and the more apt to deceive the unwary. It is an alluring poison which many have eagerly drunk whom open Socialism had not been able to deceive.”

Importantly, the encyclical affirmed that the very “characteristic of socialism,” including more modern non-communist, non-totalitarian forms that had developed since the time of Leo XIII, was “fundamentally contrary to Christian truth” (no. 111).

The encyclical gave careful thought to this. Sections 113 to 124 of *Quadragesimo Anno* deal with an extended discussion of the “more moderate” form of socialism that some more recent “socialists” had sought to develop as distinct from communism. Some of these socialists, stated the encyclical, might even try to “incline toward” or “approach the truths which Christian tradition has always held sacred.” Nonetheless, the Magisterium here recommended that if one is seeking “demands and desire” consistent with Christian truth, these are not unique or “special to Socialism. Those who work solely toward such ends have, therefore, no reason to become socialists” (no. 115). It advised, “Those who want to be apostles among socialists ought to profess Christian truth whole and entire, openly and sincerely, and not connive at error in any way. If they truly wish to be heralds of the Gospel, let them above all strive to show to socialists that socialist claims, so far as they are just, are far more strongly supported by the principles of Christian faith and much more effectively promoted through the power of Christian charity” (no. 116).

The encyclical then proceeded to flatly reject socialism:

We make this pronouncement: Whether considered as a doctrine, or an historical fact, or a movement, Socialism, if it remains truly Socialism, even after it has yielded to truth and justice on the points which we have mentioned, cannot be reconciled with the teachings of the Catholic Church because its concept of society itself is utterly foreign to Christian truth.

... Socialism, on the other hand, wholly ignoring and indifferent to this sublime end of both man and society, affirms that human association has been instituted for the sake of material advantage alone....

If Socialism, like all errors, contains some truth (which, moreover, the Supreme Pontiffs have never denied), it is based nevertheless on a theory of human society peculiar to itself and irreconcilable with true Christianity. Religious socialism, Christian socialism, are contradictory terms; no one can be at the same time a good Catholic and a true socialist....

... We have also summoned Communism and Socialism again to judgment and have found all their forms, even the most modified, to wander far from the precepts of the Gospel. (nos. 117, 118, 120, 128)

That is a clear rejection of socialism, and certainly of any notion of “Christian socialism.”

Even more liberal popes, like St. Pope John XXIII, stated, “No Catholic could subscribe even to moderate Socialism.”³³⁹ That passage actually quotes Pius XI: “Pope Pius XI further emphasized the fundamental opposition between Communism and Christianity, and made it clear that no Catholic could subscribe even to moderate Socialism. The reason is that Socialism is founded on a doctrine of human society which is bounded by time and takes no account of any objective other than that of material well-being. Since, therefore, it proposes a form of social organization which aims solely at production, it places too severe a restraint on human liberty, at the same time flouting the true notion of social authority.”

“Christian socialism” is an oxymoron.

John Paul II on Socialism

Again, so much more could be cited from the Church’s teachings on socialism, but I will finish with this verdict, issued near the end of the twentieth century and following the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe.

In May 1991, writing in his classic encyclical *Centesimus Annus*, on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*, Pope John Paul II stated that Leo XIII had “arrived at the crux of the problem” when “defining the nature of the socialism of his day as the suppression of private property.” He called particular attention to Leo XIII’s warning: “To remedy these wrongs (the unjust distribution of wealth and the poverty of the workers), the Socialists encourage the poor man’s envy of the rich and strive to do away with private property, contending that individual possessions should become the common property of all.”³⁴⁰

John Paul II also flagged Leo XIII’s admonition that socialists “distort the functions of the State, and create utter confusion in the community.” The Polish pontiff connected this to the recent slogan of “real socialism,” which had been trumpeted by the USSR in the 1970s and imposed upon its Soviet Bloc states in Eastern Europe and around the world. The very slogan

signaled a perennial problem with socialists: their ongoing fatal conceit that they were the awaited ones, the enlightened ones, the anointed ones who would do socialism right. Their socialism was the right, the true, the proper, the *real* socialism. Such is the incessant new claim of every new generation of socialists: simply give them enough power and enough of your freedom, and they will do socialism right, this time. Such were the “evils” endemic to “what would later be called ‘Real Socialism,’” said John Paul II.

And then came this crucial point from John Paul II, echoing past popes and presaging the diagnosis of his successor, Pope Benedict XVI: “We have to add that the fundamental error of socialism is anthropological in nature. Socialism considers the individual person simply as an element, a molecule within the social organism, so that the good of the individual is completely subordinated to the functioning of the socio-economic mechanism.” Socialism assumes that man’s problems can be solved by bread alone—and yet, as Jesus told Satan, man does not live by bread alone. John Paul II stated, “Socialism likewise maintains that the good of the individual can be realized without reference to his free choice. ... Man is thus reduced to a series of social relationships. ... From this mistaken conception of the person there arise both a distortion of law, which defines the sphere of the exercise of freedom, and an opposition to private property. A person who is deprived of something he can call ‘his own,’ and of the possibility of earning a living through his own initiative, comes to depend on the social machine and on those who control it.”

The person becomes the ward of the state—the nanny state, Big Brother. “This makes it much more difficult for him to recognize his dignity as a person,” said John Paul II, “and hinders progress towards the building up of an authentic human community.” This, said the pope, stands in contrast to the Christian vision of the human person: “According to *Rerum novarum* and the whole social doctrine of the Church, the social nature of man is not completely fulfilled in the State.”

From socialism’s “mistaken concept of the nature of the person” flows many mistakes and many ills, and “its first cause is atheism. ... The denial of God deprives the person of his foundation, and consequently leads to a reorganization of the social order without reference to the person’s dignity and responsibility.” Moreover, “from the same atheistic source, socialism also derives its choice of the means of action condemned in *Rerum novarum*, namely, class struggle.”

Socialism, communism—it is the same thing, the same problem. These ideologies fundamentally misunderstand man and what satisfies human beings. They fail to grasp what men and women really want and seek. These ideologies get their anthropology wrong. From that fatal, fundamental mistake follow a long line of destructive failures.

John Paul II favored a better method, known as subsidiarity. It argues that, essentially, local is best, or at least the best starting point. It opposes collectivism and statism. The principle of subsidiarity maintains that nothing should be done by a bigger and more complex organization or level of society that could instead be done by a smaller and simpler one. It looks to localism and decentralization first, whether by individuals, private and religious organizations and charities, or even local government, before looking to a larger federal bureaucracy or welfare state. Those closest to the problem or need can usually deal with it more effectively, more compassionately, and at a more human-personal level.³⁴¹

This better path was raised by John Paul II's successor, Benedict XVI, in his critique of socialism in his encyclical *Deus Caritas Est* (December 25, 2005). There, Benedict warned against the fatal conceit of “the State which would provide everything, absorbing everything into itself,” which “would ultimately become a mere bureaucracy incapable of guaranteeing the very thing which the suffering person—every person—needs: namely, loving personal concern. We do not need a State which regulates and controls everything.” Instead, said Benedict, what is needed is a state that operates “in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity,” and that does not delude itself into the “mistaken materialist conception” of man who lives “by bread alone.”

In sum, we see here a storied track record of a Church that forcefully, courageously, and eloquently stood against socialism and communism, all along earning the enmity of those targets. Moreover, it was a Church that did not merely condemn socialism and communism; it also sought to offer a better way. Above all, that way was *the Way*. It was not the path of atheism.

PART 4

**INFILTRATION AND
MANIPULATION**

CHAPTER 7

“LIQUIDATING RELIGIOUS BELIEFS”

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER AND CPUSA

The communist assault on religion was multifaceted and truly intercontinental, ranging from the fields and factories of Moscow to the streets and skyscrapers of Manhattan. Only in the annals of heaven will the full extent of the affront ever be known. Only Omniscience its very self could possibly know.

This part of the book will serve as an eye-opening snapshot in time—several chapters with testimonies that are chronological: specifically, congressional testimony from the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, from William Z. Foster to Louis Budenz, Ben Gitlow, Manning Johnson, and Bella Dodd. These sources, all prominent communists or ex-communists, could intimately testify to their comrades’ attack on religion in the United States, where the thrust was mild compared to what lashed believers in places like the USSR, China, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere. Still, it is worthwhile to pause for Americans today to see how American communists in the heyday of their movement sought to take on and take down Christianity, especially the mainline Protestant denominations, as well as the Catholic Church.

It is instructive that this part of the book is the longest. The meticulous efforts at infiltration and manipulation recorded here were at the core of

what Marxism was about and what communists did. The sources spoke at length and under oath.

These individuals gave significant testimonies that duly earned headlines in their day. Among them, the testimony in this chapter will feature excerpts from a communist who never left the party, but nonetheless spoke rather candidly (though still somewhat guardedly) about how Communist Party USA and American communists generally viewed religion. That man was William Z. Foster, one of the most important leaders in the history of American communism.

“The Biggest Suckers of Them All:” The Religious Left

But before considering the testimony of Foster and others in the pages ahead, it is crucial to convey an idea of the vital assistance that the religious left provided to American communists—a matter so significant that I wrote about it extensively in my 2010 book *Dupes: How America’s Adversaries Have Manipulated Progressives for a Century*. This background brief is helpful because several spots in the testimonies that follow invoke some of the names and organizations I will summarize here in part four.

Though it has been long obvious to sentient human beings that communists hate religion, they nevertheless had an almost preternatural ability to enchant liberal Christians. They cynically, contemptuously targeted the religious left. They knew that progressive Christians shared certain sympathies with them: workers’ rights, wealth redistribution, shrinking the income gap, denouncing the rich, fomenting class envy. Communists exploited that trust, often invoking the language of “social justice” to enlist liberals in their petitions, their marches, their campaigns, their objectives.

They had their best success with the mainline Protestant denominations: the Episcopal Church, Presbyterian Church USA, the United Methodist Church. Herbert Romerstein, who had long been one of America’s most astute and learned expert ex-communists, stated that communists found progressive pastors to be “the biggest suckers of them all.” In fact, Romerstein, to whom I dedicated my book *Dupes*, told me at the start of that research, when I asked generally if there was a particular group that communists had more success with than any other, unhesitatingly gave that

exact answer: “the religious left, Paul, they were the biggest suckers of them all.”

The word “suckers” is an apt choice. One can see in these testimonies ahead (particularly Bella Dodd’s) the use of explicit terms like “dupes,” “useful idiots,” and “sucker lists.” That latter phrase was used by even congressmen during questioning of witnesses.³⁴² It was used to describe lists of liberal individuals and organizations literally drawn up and targeted by American communists for exploitation. These lists often included progressive professors, teachers, unions, journalists, and especially religious left Christians. Suckers. Lists of suckers. Sucker lists.

In my research for *Dupes*, and numerous times elsewhere before and since, I found repeatedly, dating back a century, beginning with the launch of the Soviet Comintern and Communist Party USA (CPUSA) in 1919, atheistic communists clearly tapping social-justice language not because they believed in Jesus (quite the contrary) but to dupe believers in Jesus, specifically progressive Christians. As I dug into the Soviet Comintern Archives on CPUSA, it took little time to affirm what Romerstein had warned me about: the religious left truly did comprise the biggest suckers of them all. That obvious reality smacks one right upside the face. It is painful to see.

At the time, entire investigations were done strictly on the religious left, particularly the compilations put together by J. B. Matthews, the respected former-communist-turned-government-investigator who served as director of research for the House Committee on Un-American Activities (a committee vilified by liberals today but which for most of its life was led by Democrats). One of the most significant of these compilations is known as the “658/NCC” compilation, which indexed and detailed numerous activities (with dates and titles) of far-left Protestant pastors. The full title of the “658/NCC” compilation was “A Compilation of Public Records of 658 Clergymen and Laymen connected with the National Council of Churches,” published in April 1962, with Matthews the chief investigator. The National Council of Churches was the largest umbrella group of left-wing Protestant ministers in America, notorious for a social-justice gospel that invariably lined up with the Moscow-CPUSA party line. Another such source was the “20.5%/Episcopal” compilation, which had the full title, “A Compilation of Public Records, 20.5%, 1411 Protestant Episcopal Rectors (as of 1955),” published in March 1958.³⁴³ Note the shockingly high number of radical

rectors from the Episcopal Church—1,411 of them. These two compilations by Matthews constituted a handy “Who’s Who” manual of radical Protestant preachers, with names like the notorious Rev. Dr. John Howard Melish, Walter Russell Bowie, Joseph F. Fletcher, and Episcopal Bishop William Scarlett.³⁴⁴

Harry Ward: “Red Dean” of Radical Reverends

Among the most damaging pastors was the Rev. Harry Ward, Methodist minister, seminary professor, and founding member of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), which he ran with atheist Roger Baldwin. Baldwin wrote a dreadful 1928 book called *Liberty Under the Soviets*.

You read that correctly. Roger Baldwin, founder of the ACLU, wrote a book titled *Liberty Under the Soviets*.³⁴⁵

Ward himself wrote a book called *The Soviet Spirit*. One doubts that it was the Holy Spirit that prompted the right reverend to compose this valentine to Lenin and Stalin, which the leading communist organs the *Daily Worker* and *Masses & Mainstream* promoted vigorously, offering the book as a gift along with a paid subscription.³⁴⁶

So bad had been the ACLU in aiding and abetting American communists that various legislative committees, federal and state, considered whether it was a communist front. The 1943 California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities reported that the ACLU “may be definitely classed as a communist front.” The committee added that “at least 90 percent of its efforts are expended on behalf of communists who come into conflict with the law.” That 90 percent figure was consistent with a major report produced by Congress a decade earlier, January 17, 1931. In my research, I found constant approving references to the ACLU in CPUSA’s flagship publication, the *Daily Worker*. The *Daily Worker* loved the ACLU.³⁴⁷

Baldwin served as the founding director of the ACLU. Ward was founding national chairman, a position he would hold for two decades.

Ward was widely perceived as a staunch progressive and one of the most well-known fellow travelers of the Communist Party among clergymen. He was one of the worst offenders in the entire sordid history of the American religious left. Tellingly, a major congressional report (July

1953) on communist activities in the New York City area featured more references to Ward than any other figure—twice as many as the next most-cited figure, Earl Browder, longtime face of American communism.³⁴⁸

Was Ward a dupe or a duper? As we will see in Manning Johnson's testimony, Harry Ward may have been an actual Communist Party member. That would make him a manipulator rather than one of the manipulated, a deceiver rather than one of the deceived.

Documents in the Soviet Comintern Archives on Communist Party USA show how communist officials in Moscow and New York deliberately targeted Ward to help push their propaganda. In one letter from December 1920, Ward is listed by Comintern officials as a source to get their materials on the shelves at the seminary library.

It was not atheistic communism that concerned the Rev. Ward. No, it was *anti*-communism. Writing in *Protestant Digest* in January 1940, long before Senator Joe McCarthy arrived on the scene, Ward admonished the faithful of the perils of “anti-communism,” which was being employed “under the leadership of [Congressman Martin] Dies in a new red hunt,” one “more ruthless than that of [former Attorney General] Mitchell Palmer.” (Both Dies and Palmer were anti-communist Democrats. Dies was a Texas Democrat who headed the House Committee on Un-American Activities during the FDR era, and Palmer was attorney general to President Woodrow Wilson, who was a leading early progressive.)³⁴⁹

Ward supported a particularly awful communist front, one that merits mention here because it will rear its ugly head in the pages ahead: the American Peace Mobilization. The APM spearheaded an egregious communist campaign that enlisted liberal Christians. It was a stunning case of successful communist dupery, an abomination.

The American Peace Mobilization was secretly founded in 1940 through a literal conspiracy between Soviet and American communists, with “social justice” pastors the chief target for exploitation. The group's goal was to keep America out of World War II, to push President Franklin Roosevelt to accommodate Hitler. Why? Because Hitler had signed a non-aggression pact with Stalin in August 1939. This group thus demanded no US Lend-Lease aid to the British, as Brits were being savaged by Hitler. The group took this position because it was Stalin's position—at least until Hitler betrayed Stalin and invaded the USSR in June 1941, at which point

the group immediately became pro-war, morphing from doves to hawks. As Congress later noted, this was “one of the most seditious organizations which ever operated in the United States,” “one of the most notorious and blatantly Communist fronts ever organized in this country,” and an “instrument of the Communist Party line.”³⁵⁰

In a previous book, I shared the actual declassified Soviet document (published on [page 142](#) of *Dupes*) stating that the American Peace Mobilization was created “on the initiative of our Party [CPUSA] in Chicago” in September 1940. To reiterate: the goal of the American Peace Mobilization was to keep America from fighting and stopping Hitler strictly because Hitler and Stalin were (momentarily) allies. They did so on direct orders from their managers and masters in the Kremlin. These communist Americans saluted their flag—the red flag of Stalin’s USSR.

This was a pernicious position. Yet, the “peace” mobilization, which suddenly became pro-war the minute Hitler betrayed Stalin and invaded the USSR—and then brazenly changed its name to the American *People’s* Mobilization (yes, no kidding)—had more success with peace-loving, turn-the-other-cheek liberal Christians than any other group, far and away. Progressive Protestant pastors were the primary target.

The New York Times described the American Peace Mobilization not as a communist front but a “group of clergymen.” And why not? Of the signers to the mobilization’s mass rally in New York in April 1941, a quarter of the names began with “Reverend.” It is hard to blame the *Times* for being suckered on this one. The social-justice pastors made it easy.

As for the pastors, if these presumably sincere Christians knew how badly they were used to advance the worst of evils, they would have been on their knees pleading forgiveness. In fact, many came to realize how badly they had been used.

William Z. Foster

All of that background is important for better understanding some of the material denoted in the pages ahead by the likes of William Z. Foster, Ben Gitlow, Louis Budenz, Manning Johnson, Bella Dodd, and others. We will start with Foster, the only one among them to have never repented.

William Z. Foster was, in effect, the first public face as well as chairman of what became known as (and remains to this day) Communist

Party USA. Holding that spot from 1929–34, prior to which he had been with the Socialist Party of America, Foster would be succeeded as chair by the equally famous (or infamous) Earl Browder. Foster's testimony is powerful for not only its illumination of the communist contempt for religion but for its plainspoken evidence of how American communists were not dedicated to America. Their loyalty lay in a system of government far from America's shores. That is crucial to understand because it also means that their primary country of loyalty, the USSR, gave them orders, including orders regarding religion and how to treat the religious.

Foster, it should be noted, was a member of Roger Baldwin's and Harry Ward's ACLU before he took the helm at Communist Party USA. Such is perhaps another not-so-subtle indicator of how the ACLU's undermining of religion would be more lasting and damaging than anything that CPUSA ever pulled off.

Chairman Foster, twice Communist Party candidate for president of the United States, openly advocated a "Soviet American Republic" as part of a "world Soviet Union." Foster spoke candidly of American communists' goal of creating a "Soviet America." That was the title of his 1932 book, *Toward Soviet America*.³⁵¹

Members of communist parties around the world, including in the United States, saw themselves as loyal Soviet foot soldiers. It would be Moscow first. These communists served not America but the Soviet Union. As Lincoln Steffens, the popular journalist for *The New Republic*, unforgettably put it, "I am a patriot for Russia; the Future is there; Russia will win out and it will save the world."³⁵² Emphatically agreeing with Steffens was Langston Hughes, the celebrated African-American poet. "Put one more 'S' in the USA to make it Soviet," thrilled Hughes. "The USA when we take control will be the USSA."³⁵³

Herb Romerstein repeatedly stressed this loyalty point: "Communist Party members were loyal Soviet patriots. ... Most were not qualified to be spies, but those who were qualified were recruited through Party channels and made available to Soviet intelligence for classic espionage, agent-of-influence operations, or as couriers." He said that "almost every spy" tapped by the Soviets was a member of the American party.³⁵⁴ CPUSA was a major recruiting ground for Soviet espionage, and some of those

communists in turn saluted the red flag and consciously collaborated with Moscow. That brings us to the testimony of Chairman Foster.

A telling display of this loyalty to the Soviet Union was a 1930 exchange between him and Congressman Hamilton Fish (R-NY):

Fish: Now, if I understand you, the workers in this country [America] look upon the Soviet Union as their country; is that right?

Foster: The more advanced workers do.

Fish: Look upon the Soviet Union as their country?

Foster: Yes.

Fish: They look upon the soviet flag as their flag?

Foster: The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag and that is the red flag. That is the flag of the proletarian revolution....

Fish: Well, the workers of this country consider, then, the Soviet Government to be their country. Do they also consider the red flag to be their flag?

Foster: I have answered quite clearly.

Fish: Do you owe allegiance to the American flag; does the Communist Party owe allegiance to the American flag?

Foster: The workers, the revolutionary workers, in all the capitalist countries are an oppressed class who are held in subjection by their respective capitalist governments and their attitude toward these governments is the abolition of these governments and the establishment of soviet governments.

Fish: Well, they do not claim any allegiance, then, to the American flag in this country?

Foster: That is, you mean, the support of capitalism in America—no.

Fish: I mean if they had to choose between the red flag and the American flag, I take it from you that you would choose the red flag; is that correct?

Foster: I have stated my answer.

Fish: I do not want to force you to answer if it embarrasses you, Mr. Foster.

Foster: It does not embarrass me at all. I stated very clearly the red flag is the flag of the revolutionary class, and we are part of the revolutionary class.

Fish: I understood that.

Foster: And all capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class, and we owe no allegiance to them.

Fish: Well, that answers the question.³⁵⁵

It did indeed. William Z. Foster's sentiment and loyalty spoke for itself. And yet, this is just a portion of what he said under oath that day. What Foster expressed candidly in his testimony to the Fish Committee, this formal congressional committee, is worth quoting at length as a sterling affirmation of what members of the American Communist Party had believed from the outset. Hamilton Fish asked and asked, and William Z. Foster answered and answered:

Fish: Would you mind stating to the committee the aims and principles of the Communist Party?

Foster: The aims and principles of the Communist Party, briefly stated, are to organize the workers to defend their interests under the capitalist system and to eventually abolish the capitalist system and to establish a workers' and farmers' government.

Fish: Now, can you tell us more definitely if the principles of the Communist Party, as advocated in this country, or anywhere else, are the same?

Foster: Yes.

Fish: Does the Communist Party advocate the confiscation of all private property?

Foster: The Communist Party advocates the overthrow of the capitalist system and the confiscation of the social necessities of life; that is, the basic industries and other industries for producing the means of livelihood for the people. By the property of individuals, personal belongings, and so on, no; that is, in the sense of their personal property.

It is important to note here that not all communists would agree with this, or be so *generous* as to allow even personal belongings under a communist system. The communists who governed China under Mao, Cambodia under Pol Pot, and North Korea under the Kim family were woeful in their complete confiscation of the most basic personal belongings, from pots and pans to deodorant and toothpaste. And that was hardly a mere Asian phenomenon. Castro's Cuba, for example, not even a hundred miles from Key West, Florida, has likewise been brutal in its limitations on personal property, from private garden plots and fruit trees to fishing poles and boats.

The conversation between Congressman Fish and comrade Foster continued, with the congressman asking about religion and marriage under a communist system. Foster's answer was both unsettling and unsurprising:

Fish: Does your party advocate the abolition and destruction of religious beliefs?

Foster: Our party considers religion to be the opium of the people, as Karl Marx has stated, and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices amongst the workers.

Fish: To be a member of the Communist Party, do you have to be an atheist?

Foster: In order to be—there is no formal requirement to this effect. Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious scruples, or religious ideas; but a worker who will join the Communist Party, who understands the elementary principles of the Communist Party, must necessarily be in the process of liquidating his religious beliefs and, if he still has any lingerings when he joins the party, he will soon get rid of them. But irreligion, that is atheism, is not laid down as a formal requirement for membership in the Communist Party.

Fish: Have you been to Russia?

Foster: Yes. Eight or nine times.

Fish: You are familiar, then, with the workings of the Communist Party in Russia?

Foster: Reasonably.

Fish: Well, can members of the Communist in Russia be married in the church and maintain religious beliefs of that nature, and practice them?

Foster: My opinion is that a member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union who would be married in a church would not be any value to the Communist Party.

Fish: Could he maintain his membership in the party?

Foster: He would not.

Fish: He would be put out of the party?

Foster: Eventually, if not for that specific act.

Fish: Would it not be the same in this country?

Foster: As stated before, workers who would be so imbued with religious superstitions that they would be married in a church would be of no value to the Communist Party.

Fish: And the same thing would happen to them in this country that happens to them in Russia?

Foster: Of course.

Foster's answer shocked people in his day, and probably still shocks today. It should not. This has been the standard communist view of religion since the time of Marx and Lenin. As readers of this book know, Foster's views were positively mild compared to his Marxist-Leninist predecessors.

Congressman Fish then asked Foster about class hatred and world revolution.

Fish: Does your party believe in the promotion of class hatred?

Foster: This is a peculiar question. What do you mean by "class hatred?"

Fish: I mean stirring up and exciting class antagonism and hatred of the working class against the other classes, so called?

Foster: Our party believes in developing the class consciousness of the workers; to educate the workers to an understanding of their class interests and to organize them to defend that class interest which, inevitably, brings them into conflict with the capitalist class in its whole system of ideology.

Fish: Do the Communists in this country advocate world revolution?

Foster: Yes; the Communists in this country realize that America is connected up with the whole world system, and the capitalist system displays the same characteristics everywhere—everywhere it makes for the misery and exploitation of the workers—and it must be abolished, not only on an American scale but on a world scale.

Fish: So that they do advocate world revolution; and do they advocate revolution in this country?

Foster: I have stated that the Communists advocate the abolition of the capitalist system in this country and every other country; that this must develop out of the sharpening of the class struggle and the struggle of the workers for bread and butter.

Of course, communists were all about class hatred. The "world revolution" would be based on the separation of people according to class, with certain classes unquestionably the target of hatred—as Lenin had said and showed repeatedly, as had his henchmen, such as Martin Latsis. "We are exterminating the bourgeoisie as a class," calmly explained Latsis, head of the Cheka, a predecessor to the KGB. "In your investigations don't look for documents and pieces of evidence about what the defendant has done,

whether in deed or in speaking or acting against Soviet authority. The first question you should ask him is what class he comes from, what are his roots, his education, his training, and his occupation. These questions define the fate of the accused.”³⁵⁶

They sure did. Foster’s bosses in the USSR, carrying out their Marxist-Leninist world revolution and class struggle, exterminated people on the basis of class. Your class defined your fate. Just as being a Jew could get you exterminated under the Nazi system, being a member of the bourgeoisie could get you exterminated under the Soviet system.

That exchange prompted Congressman Fish to ask Foster about the American republican form of government, and if such was precisely what Foster and his comrades wanted to literally overthrow, on behalf of (and with the go-ahead) of the Communist International (that is, the Comintern). Here was that intriguing exchange:

Fish: Now, are the Communists in this country opposed to our republican form of government?

Foster: The capitalist democracy—most assuredly. We stand for a workers’ and farmers’ government; a government of producers, not a government of exploiters. The American capitalist Government is built and controlled in the interests of those who own the industries and we say that the Government must be built and controlled by those who work in the industries and who produce.

Fish: They are opposed to our republican form of government?

Foster: Most assuredly.

Fish: And they desire to overthrow it through revolutionary methods?

Foster: I would like to read from the program of the Communist International at this point. The Communist International program says----

At this point in his remarks, Foster paused to read from [page 34](#) of the Comintern program document that he was holding, which he quoted as stating, “The conquest of power by the proletariat does not mean peaceful capturing of ready-made bourgeois state machinery by means of a parliamentary majority. The bourgeoisie resorts to every means of violence and terror to safeguard and strengthen its predatory property and political domination. Like the feudal nobility of the past, the bourgeoisie cannot abandon its historical position to the new class without a desperate and frantic struggle; hence the violence of the bourgeoisie can only be suppressed by the stern violence of the proletariat.”

Congressman Fish sought further clarity on this point, asking Foster, “Just what is the Third International?” Foster responded by pointing to the

Communist International, which was one and the same:

Foster: The Communist International is the world party of the Communist movement.

Fish: Is the Communist Party of the United States connected with it?

Foster: It is.

Fish: In what way?

Foster: It is the American section.

Fish: You take your orders from the Third International; do you?

Foster: The question, “Do we take our orders from the Communist International?” is a question which reveals the utter distance of the capitalist conception of organization from that of the worker. The Communist International is a world party, based upon the mass parties in the respective countries. It works out its policy by the mass principles of these parties in all its deliberations. It is a party that conducts the most fundamental examination of all questions that come before it and, when a decision is arrived at in any given instance, this decision the workers, with their customary sense of proletarian discipline, accept and put into effect.

Fish: Then you do take the orders and carry them out, as decided in Moscow by the Third International of the Communist Party?

Foster: I stated it is not a question of taking orders.

Fish: Well, putting them into effect?

Foster: It is a question of working out policies with the Comintern, in the Comintern, as party of this proletarian organization.

Fish: Well, they have to carry out those orders; do they not?

Foster: Carry out the policies?

Fish: Carry out the orders and policies as initiated by the Third International of the Communist Party over in Moscow?

Foster: We carry out the policies in the way I have stated.

Fish: You believe that by advocating the substitution of the soviet system of government for the republican form of government you are operating under the law?

Foster: I, of course, do not say we derived our theories from the Declaration of Independence, but the Declaration of Independence says that when a government demonstrates that it no longer represents the interests of the masses it is not only the right but the duty of these masses to dispose of that government and to establish one that will represent their interests—to abolish that government.

Fish: That is, what you advocate is a change of our republican form of government and the substituting of the soviet form of government?

Foster: I have stated that a number of times.

Again, this exchange was highly illuminating. And in wrapping up, Foster confirmed that he had previously affirmed “a number of times” that he was in fact advocating replacing the American form of republican government with the “soviet form of government.” That “soviet form” (the s in “soviet” printed in lowercase by the US government’s printing office) was the form of government of the Soviet Comintern and the Soviet Union—the home and headquarters of the red flag that Foster and his American Communist Party and their comrades saluted.

Comrade Browder Takes the Wheel

Foster's successor as head of the American Communist Party was Earl Browder (1891–1973), who was chairman of CPUSA from 1934 to 1945. He, too, did not shirk from expressing where his true loyalties resided. "Above all," Browder stated in his 1934 CPUSA convention report, "we arm ourselves with the political weapons forged by the victorious Communist Party of the Soviet Union, with the mighty sword of Marxism-Leninism, and are strengthened and inspired by the victories of socialist construction won under its Bolshevik leadership headed by Stalin." The pro-Stalin, pro-Soviet patriot continued, "Our World Communist Party, the Communist International, provides us the guarantee not only of our victory in America, but of the victory of the proletariat throughout the world."³⁵⁷

The Comintern of the 1930s, during Browder's time, had not backed down from its earlier 1920s triumphant and militaristic pronouncements. In its published "conditions for admission," the Comintern stated that its members—which, of course, included CPUSA members—"must render every possible assistance to the Soviet Republics in their struggles against counter-revolutionary forces. They should conduct an organized and definite propaganda to induce the workers to refuse to make or handle any kind of military equipment intended for use against the Soviet Republics, and should also carry on, by legal or illegal means, a propaganda among any troops sent against the Workers' Republics."³⁵⁸

For members of CPUSA, things remained crystal clear: your first priority was the Soviet Union. Period.

And as for CPUSA, it stated forthrightly, "We want our Party to become like an army, a Bolshevik army, who while understanding the policy behind each decision is prepared to carry it out with military promptness, without any hesitation or question, and further, to carry out the decisions with Bolshevik judgment and maximum effectiveness."³⁵⁹

A Bolshevik army inside of America. *Forward!*

"The Enemy of Religion"

Summing up all of Earl Browder's anti-religious statements would take up quite a few pages. For simplicity purposes, this section will focus strictly on

his important and revealing 1935 book *Communism in the United States*, which conveniently follows the timeline in our narrative here.

In that book, particularly the final chapter, titled “Religion and Communism,” which was based on a February 15, 1935 discussion between Browder and a group of students at the “Christian progressive” Union Theological Seminary in New York, Browder was his usual slippery self. Effusive and elusive when talking about the Communist Party and religion, he tried to toe a line between his dedication to the party and to not posing too much of a threat to American believers and their constitutional freedom of religion—while trying to reel in some new suckers from his religious left audience. Still, comrade Browder unavoidably uncorked a few gems that exposed just where he and his American Communist Party stood on matters of religion. He could not avoid stating the obvious: communism and religion were implacable foes.

“It is quite clear that the Communist Party is the enemy of religion,” said Browder honestly, in a candid affirmation of the obvious. “We Communists try to do the opposite of what we hold religion does.” He noted, “The Communist Party takes the position that the social function of religion and religious institutions is to act as an opiate to keep the lower classes passive, to make them accept the bad conditions under which they have to live in the hope of a reward after death.”³⁶⁰ Marx and Engels would have nodded.

Browder’s communists had a special contempt for organized religion. “Institutionalized religion is the particular enemy,” noted Browder, surely thinking of the likes of the Roman Catholic Church in particular.³⁶¹

Conversely, Browder understood that religion, being a matter of spirit, was a natural foe of communism, which rejected the spiritual in favor of the strictly material. “Religion does not fit into a dialectical materialist system of thought,” affirmed Browder, reaching for more belligerent, Lenin-like language: “It is the enemy of it.”³⁶²

And yet, Browder did his best to try to not seem too harsh toward American religious believers—because he was looking to continue to grow his party. He was always willing to welcome some new suckers. He said that the Communist Party was now up to 31,000 members, a sharp rise of 14,000 members over the past year and a half. The party was pushing hard for new recruits, whether among labor, farmers, teachers, women, racial

minorities—“the majority of the Negroes are influenced by the Communists,” said Browder, particularly amid the party’s push in the “Black Belt” (the “Negro South”)³⁶³—and perhaps even possibly among the religious.³⁶⁴

When asked what the party does with those who are religious but strangely interested in joining the party (no doubt an interest by some of the left-wing UTS students), Browder explained, “When workers come into the Party still actively religious, we accept them, not because we accept their religion, but because we know that the process of discarding religious beliefs, which are in the last analysis reactionary, is a more or less protracted one. We expect religion to be eliminated only in the course of a few generations of the new society, the socialist society.”

Recall that Vladimir Lenin had said precisely the same.

Stupid “Christian communists” might be allowed in, but only under the pretext that their stupid Christian beliefs would soon be discarded. And if the discarding was not done soon enough, the comrades would prod, perhaps with a little harassment: “While we do not ask of them that they give up their religion,” said a charitable Browder, “we will subject their religious beliefs to a careful and systematic criticism, and we expect that the religious beliefs will not be able to stand up under such criticism.” In practice, such criticism took the form of ridicule and haranguing—or, in the USSR, a process of suggest, shove, and shoot. A little goad here, a little gulag there. Moreover, added Browder, they certainly would not place “in the most responsible leading positions of the movement people who had strong religious beliefs.” Such people would be considered “dangerous” because of the social influence they could have on “the masses.”³⁶⁵

So, while this slight tolerance might be accepted for new comrades into the party, a clemency would only be granted so long, until those religious beliefs were purged and self-liquidated. “I would not want to hold out any hopes that the Communists will be converted to religion,” Browder told students at Union Theological Seminary. “We would not want to give the slightest indication that there is any prospect of a rapprochement between communism and religion as such.”³⁶⁶

No question that such was the true spirit of communism. But in the coming days ahead, Comrade Browder would be singing a sweeter tune, as

part of an outstretched hand of *peace* and purported rapprochement with the religious. Or, at least, such would be the new tactic.

CHAPTER 8

“OUTSTRETCHED HAND”

EARL BROWDER’S BACKHAND

Far and away, communists had their greatest success pursuing left-wing Protestants. This will be clear in the testimony in the chapters ahead, particularly the witness of Ben Gitlow and Manning Johnson.

Nevertheless, American communists made a hard push for American Catholics, as they did with other target groups—teachers, steelworkers, coalminers, farmers, African Americans, women, professors, journalists, mainline Protestants. This is abundantly evident in their literature and strategizing in the period, both overt and covert. Communists conceded it.

The Venona Secrets, the groundbreaking work by Herbert Romerstein and Eric Breindel, discussed such efforts at length. It detailed the well-known offer in June 1938 by Earl Browder to try to find common ground with Catholics. “We extend the hand of brotherly cooperation to the great mass of democratic Catholics,” insisted the CPUSA chairman, in what came to be known as the policy or tactic of the “outstretched hand.”³⁶⁷

That thinking was explained by communist organizer Louis Budenz, who at a sensitive meeting of the Communist Party Central Committee Plenum in December 1938 noted that “the overwhelming majority of Catholics of all national origins are Democrats.” This meant that they were deemed ripe targets “in the building of the democratic front”—a wider popular-front strategy. Communists salivated at the prospect of a wide tent

of leftists, drawn from the Communist Party and the Democratic Party, working together on behalf of Marxist-Leninist goals.

Budenz and Browder and their ilk conceded, “We cannot begin to touch the Democratic Party at any point, particularly in the industrial centers and also in its progressive wing, without being confronted with active Catholic leaders.” To get Democrats meant getting Catholics, which would not be easy.

Later, after leaving communism and converting to Catholicism, Budenz would confess to his fellow Catholics that communists had employed this “outstretched hand” to manipulate them and infiltrate their ranks.³⁶⁸

The saga of this outstretched hand—really, a concealed backhand—is one of the more revelatory episodes in the history of communists seeking to sucker religious groups, notably Catholics. In some quarters, that campaign has never ended, even in the year 2019, when leading Catholic publications like *America* magazine run articles by pro-communist Catholics with titles like “The Catholic Case for Communism.”

The story of Earl Browder’s long outstretched hand should serve as a cautionary tale for ours and future generations.

Target: Eighteen Million Catholics

A striking document from this period was presented by Romerstein and Breindel in *The Venona Secrets*. Researcher Mary Nicholas procured a copy of it from Romerstein’s private papers now archived at the Hoover Institution. Nicholas shared it with me. It is also housed at the Library of Congress in the Soviet Comintern Archives on Communist Party USA.

The 1937 CPUSA document, titled “Confidential report on work in religious and non-religious Catholic organizations,” will startle Catholics today, but will not surprise anyone familiar with the webs weaved by communists. The document began:

Today, with the issue of Spain being in the forefront, a tremendous organized campaign, world wide in scope, is gaining momentum with the purpose of winning the Catholic masses for fascism. The two countries wherein this campaign is most intense is in Ireland and in the United States.

In the forefront of this campaign, and the directing force of it, is the Catholic church as represented by the Vatican....

A real race is on as to which force will win over the Catholic people in this country—the forces of reaction and fascism as represented by the Catholic church or the forces of progress

and democracy.

Such was the stark choice posed by communists: Catholic Church “reaction and fascism” vs. enlightened “progress and democracy.” The report then noted the recent reelection of FDR as president of the United States, and that “the Vatican, being sensitively attuned to this result, sent to this country, just before the elections, Cardinal Paccelli [spelling incorrect]. As is known, Cardinal Paccelli had an important interview with President Roosevelt.”

That Cardinal Pacelli was none other than Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli, the future Pope Pius XII. That conversation between Pacelli and FDR was especially interesting. On November 5, 1936, Pacelli, visiting America as Vatican secretary of state, met with a newly reelected FDR at the president’s Hyde Park mansion.³⁶⁹ It was a friendly get-together, despite what FDR dubbed a “mental sparring contest” with the future pontiff. Pacelli warned FDR of the “great danger” of communism in America, which FDR characteristically dismissed. FDR explained that he was chiefly concerned about America sliding into fascism, not Marxism. Fascism was the fear, not communism. “No,” replied Pacelli. “Yes,” countered FDR. This went back and forth before a bewildered Pacelli finally said, “Mr. President, you simply do not understand the terrible importance of the communist movement!”³⁷⁰ No, he did not.

American communists knew they had a chump in FDR, and they played the president like a violin.³⁷¹

As for Catholics, this 1937 “Confidential report on work in religious and non-religious Catholic organizations” sniffed out an alleged Vatican “anti-communist campaign,” as if this was something new and insidious by Rome.³⁷² The report continued:

From all known facts there is no doubt that the Vatican has come to a decision to launch a powerful, energetic, anti-communist campaign; and one of the most important focal points of this campaign is and will be the United States which contains approximately 18,000,000 Catholics.

At the last District Convention of the New York District of our Party two things were clearly revealed [original misspelling] – one, that the Party has within its ranks a pitifully small number of Irish Catholics; and two, that the influence of the Party directly or indirectly through various progressive organizations has very little influence amongst the Irish Catholic people nationally and particularly in New York City which has the greatest number of Irish Catholic people.

Within the territory of Section 18 lies one of the most heavily concentrated areas of Irish Catholics and Catholic churches. Between 110 St. and 59th St. there are approximately eight large Catholic churches and a Catholic population of approximately 80,000.

After the District Convention, it was decided in our Section to do some concentration work amongst the Catholic people and in Catholic religious and non-religious organizations. It was felt that if any results were obtained they would point the direction which the Party should take in its organizational work, and would also reveal new methods of work that would be of benefit to the Party generally.

The scope of this memorandum will be to report on the steps that we have taken, the results obtained and a few organizational proposals which are felt will further aid and extend our activities. It is trusted also that the report will serve to coordinate the work and give direction to it in other parts of the city.

These were remarkable numbers of Catholics. No wonder communists were salivating like Pavlovian dogs. Imagine: eighteen million Catholics in America, and eighty thousand simply between New York's 110th St. and 59th St. To think that Communist Party USA, even here in the 1930s, its heyday, never exceeded one hundred thousand members nationwide. Eighteen million Catholics crushed one hundred thousand commies. For the reds, if they could pick up even 1 percent of American Catholics, they would explode their membership rolls. It seems pathetic to imagine that they never squeaked out even that.

Page 2 of this 1937 report then laid out in caps this heading: "CATHOLIC ORGANISATIONS IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA—STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF SAME," which stated: "In the metropolitan area there are 199 Catholic parishes, parishoners [original misspelling] number an average of 7,000 to each parish. Each parish has within it at least two organizations functioning; that is, a Holy Name Society which is exclusively a men's organization, and a Sacred Heart Society which is exclusively a woman's organization. The average membership of a Holy Name branch within a parish is about 500, and about 700 for the Sacred Heart." The report attempted to profile the work of these organizations. It then made this striking admission, which America's eighteen million Catholics would have ached to know more about in 1937: "Without going into any details as to how certain contacts were made, developed and finally recruited into the Communist Party, we are able to report, as will be seen later, that we now have a small number of Party members in important and strategic posts within these organizations."

This information would have given serious pause to Catholics within these organizations. Very careful not to name names even in an internal

confidential report (never knowing if there were saboteurs in the midst), the report stated:

An example of rendering ineffective many reactionary measures can be cited in the work of our Party comrades in the parish of one of the most important, powerful and strategic churches in New York, which will be un-named in this report. We have a Party comrade who is secretary of the Holy Name branch in this parish, which is one of the largest branches in the city. In addition, this branch is most important because of the fact that it gives leadership and shapes the policies of most of the reactionary and anti-communist campaigns that are now developing in the Catholic world. This comrade is well known in conservative Irish Catholic circles, and the many offices which he holds in various Catholic organizations will be hereinafter described. In addition to this comrade, we have three other loyal and devoted Party comrades who are also members of this important branch. Through careful guidance and skillful work, these comrades have been able to in no small degree render ineffective many reactionary and anti-communist measures which would have been taken on by this branch.

In order to effectively combat the anti-communist campaign originating in these organizations, it is very necessary that as many capable and qualified Party members as is possible become regular functioning members of the various Holy Name societies in the city.

It will be found that admission to these societies is not an easy matter as each applicant is thoroughly investigated, his background and church affiliations are gone into and he generally must receive the recommendation of his parish priest. This, in turn, will only be forthcoming if the applicant has a fairly substantial record of church affiliations.

It is advisable to set up a leading fraction composed of comrades who are already members of the Holy Name Societies. This fraction would be able to choose those Party members who are best qualified to enter the Holy Name Societies, and the fraction members would also be able to facilitate the admission of Party members into Holy Name Societies by methods and through channels best known to themselves.

Catholics would have been aghast to know the identity of these moles in their ranks. The “Party comrade” is the type that communists used to refer to in those days as a “Judas goat”—that is, a betrayer. In this case, the Judas goat was working for the Communist Party and betraying the Church. (The party comrade, a priest, was identified by Herb Romerstein and Eric Breindel in their book.³⁷³) The comrades wanted as many Judases as possible working from within Christ’s Church.

From there, the report assessed the status of several major Catholic organizations that the comrades had their eyes on. First among these was (again listed in caps), “THE ARCH DIOCESAN UNION.” On this group, the 1937 report assessed:

This is composed of elected delegates from Holy Name Societies throughout the State. Invariably the most influential and important leaders of the Holy Name branches are elected to the Arch Diocesan Union, the greater majority of them being priests. This is the highest governing body of the Holy Name Societies and directs the policies and functions and

activities of the Holy Name branches. From the New York State Arch Diocesan Union delegates will be elected to a national congress.

It is almost a certainty that our key Party member, secretary of the Holy Name branch described above, will be elected to the Arch Diocesan Union as a delegate of this most important branch. In addition, arrangements are already being made to have one or two other Party members elected as delegates. The importance of this needs no further explanation.

Indeed this needed no further explanation. The smoke of the Communist Party was creeping into the Church.

Next, on page 3 of the single-spaced, wide-margin, nine-page report, Communist Party USA appraised the situation with (again written in caps), “THE EUCHARISTIC LEAGUE.” Here it stated:

The crystallization in an organized form of the reactionary and anti-communist campaign being conducted by the Catholic church is in the process of taking shape in the organization of a westside “Eucharistic League”. This is being promoted by one of the most outstanding leaders in the anti-communist campaign—a Paulist priest, Father Ward. Father Ward is also the editor of a monthly anti-communist paper entitled “Wisdom”.

A meeting of the sponsoring committee of this league was held January 6th in the Paulist church. Difficulties already confront the organization by internal friction. At least one Party member, through our contacts, is sure of appointment to the executive board of the organization.

On January 8 at the Paulist church, the first mass meeting of the Eucharistic League was held. There was an attendance of about 800 Catholics. At this mass meeting about three or four of our Party members were in attendance and became charter members of the organization.

The Party, through the leading fraction suggested above, will also have to carefully select available and qualified comrades to enter the Eucharistic League. Although the Eucharistic League has not definitely announced itself as anti-communist as yet, it must be taken for granted that Father Ward has the objective of using this league to further the anti-communist campaign of the Catholic church.

This section of the report speaks for itself. The comrades were confident that at least one party member was “sure of appointment” to the executive board of the Eucharistic League. Moreover, at the first mass meeting at the Paulist church, three or four party members had managed to hoodwink enough of the attendees to worm their way into being no less than charter members of the organization. That is quite a coup to pull off from within such a staunchly anti-communist organization. From there, these key inside members from the party’s “leading faction” would be able to screen out those who did not toe the Moscow line.

Continuing along these lines of infiltration and deceit, the confidential report next noted the communists’ successful penetration of a devotedly anti-communist Catholic publication, the aforementioned *Wisdom*:

“WISDOM”

This is a monthly newspaper publication which has as its masthead the following: “Wisdom - the Challenge to Atheism and Communism”. The editor of this paper is the Father Ward referred to above. This publication has a circulation of about 20,000 copies amongst the church parishes, parochial schools, high schools and colleges. It is now also taking on an anti-semitic policy as is evidenced by its last issue. The publication has just started a column which will be a college forum devoted to the crusade against Communism in the colleges. It is developing a staff of college correspondents who will reflect the activities in the various educational institutions.

Through the work of our Party comrades and various contacts, we are able to report that we have two Party members now on the editorial staff of the publication and who write regularly in the columns of “Wisdom”. Attached to this report, you will find issues of “Wisdom” containing the columns of these Party members, the articles are marked off in crayon. It is a most difficult position for them inasmuch as they have to write in such a manner as to be progressive and yet be within bounds so as not to become exposed and dismissed.

This was another magnificent coup by the comrades. They had placed two of their moles, their atheist saboteurs, on the editorial staff of *Wisdom*, this Catholic anti-communist publication. They were even penning columns. They employed a tone allowing them to cloak themselves as progressives rather than communists. The willingness to lie was at once remarkable and shameless.

In the next section of this Communist Party USA confidential report to the Comintern, the dutiful comrades gave their assessment of another Catholic organization they were trying to infiltrate and influence, a group called the Trinity League. The report stated:

THE TRINITY LEAGUE

This organization has its headquarters at 32 West 69th St., and is controlled by such well known reactionaries and red baiters as Father Ward, Martha Byrne and Dr. Schultz. Martha Byrne is a Tammany appointee to the position of County Court Recorder. Dr. Schultz is a weekly commentator on station WLWL every Monday evening at 7 o'clock. The address of Dr. Schultz every Monday evening is strictly anti-communist talk, and is one of the regular anti-communist programs on the radio in this city. Station WLWL is the station owned and controlled by the Paulist Fathers church which has been mentioned herein and will be further described later.

The Trinity League holds public meetings every Monday night, at its headquarters, commencing at 8 o'clock, at which Dr. Schultz officiates, and have an average attendance of 300 people weekly. Both the radio talks and the weekly meetings have been urging the formation of Catholic youth groups.

We have assigned a capable woman comrade to attend the Trinity League meetings, and she will keep the comrades assigned to this work informed of all developments within the league. We strongly urge that a few qualified comrades also enter the Trinity League for carrying on the correct type of work.

One marvels at the audacity of these New York communists. This was not a mere matter of attempting to penetrate a religious left organization within, say, the Episcopal or Methodist denominations, where perhaps “social justice” warriors might be more open and welcoming to the red platform. Quite the contrary, these were Catholic groups and individuals who were diehard and ever-vigilant in opposing Marxism and Moscow. And yet, the comrades did not shy from taking them on and slithering inside.

The confidential report proceeded from there, analyzing still other Catholic entities. Next, it looked at “the Franciscans,” which the comrades dismissed as “a violent anti-communist Catholic order.” This seemed to be judged a lost cause, with no assessment (at least in this document) of how to try to sneak into the Franciscans.

The same was true for the Knights of Columbus, listed along with the Franciscans on page four of the report, and likewise dismissed as “another Catholic organization, extremely reactionary and anti-communist in policy and set-up.” The comrades were impressed by the size of the K of C and its 2,464 councils in the United States and Canada. “Nearly all of the members are members of the petty bourgeoisie,” the report sniffed.

In all, the comrades seemed cautiously optimistic, with lines in the report such as, “We already have a number of comrades in the church organizations.” The report summed up, “The foregoing facts are evidence that the Party must give immediate attention to this type of work. Within a few months time and after careful attention the above described activities have been developed.”

And in addition to the infiltration, the report noted another crucial development: the comrades had slyly created an entirely new front-group, one employing a favored name of choice: *progressives*. The group was called “the American Irish Progressives.” This would be of “definite progressive and liberal character on all of the social, economic and cultural matters pertaining to the Irish nationals and Irish Americans.” Of course, communists would work from inside the organization, hand in hand with these progressives and liberals, to ensure that they tacitly supported (or at least did not criticize) the CPUSA-Soviet line, all the while denouncing anti-communists for their hysteria—that is, for “attacking Communism rather than organizing and helping the Irish Catholic working people.”

Communists clearly were enthusiastic about the prospects for the group. Much could be achieved through “our comrades in the American Irish

Progressives.” “We have developed an extensive program of activity for the American Irish Progressives,” the report concluded. “From the above facts and all the surrounding circumstances, it is believed that the right moment has come for the building of a progressive organization amongst the Irish American Catholics.”

Most telling in this report is the sense of assuredness that an organization could be affected and manipulated by only a handful of well-trained Communist Party plants. Communist organizers were consummate sneaks, and grasped far too well the power of having “a small number of Party members in important and strategic posts within these organizations.”

Deceitful as this was, one must marvel at the cynical shrewdness at work. Communists understood that just a handful of saboteurs, operating from the inside through carefully calculated dishonesty, could go far in impacting if not redirecting and hijacking an organization.

Alas, it should be noted that, significantly, seminaries are not mentioned here in this confidential report, though active priests were. The general target was Irish Catholics, especially progressive ones who might be manipulated. That included certain priests. Did the comrades expand their scope to include not just the occasional Catholic club or league, or Irish progressives, or the K of C? More specifically, were they so bold as to take aim at Catholic seminaries?

We shall consider that provocative question in a coming chapter.

Catholics Say No

In the meantime, the good news is that Catholics clearly rejected this. In fact, what was confidential in 1937 became somewhat more open in 1938, even if the motives were not stated quite so transparently by the comrades. That year, in May, Earl Browder, who was very open if not downright winsome about desiring to create a wider popular front—including among his outreach and allies no less than Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt—made a public push for Catholics.

On May 29, 1938, Browder gave an eye-opening public speech—least of all because it was four hours long—in which he extended the Marxist hand to the Catholic Church. “In a speech which has had few parallels in length outside of legislative halls,” the *New York Times* rightly reported, “Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist party in the United

States, extended ‘the hand of brotherly cooperation’ to the Catholics yesterday.”³⁷⁴

Further revealing the imperative, the Communist Party wasted no time publishing the speech within mere days via a June 1938 booklet by Earl Browder titled *A Message to Catholics*.³⁷⁵ The book not only reprinted Browder’s text but included an introduction by Communist Party USA’s National Committee. That introduction noted, importantly, that “early in 1936 the Communist Party of France sent forth a wholehearted appeal for a brotherly alliance and a mutually respectful collaboration between Communist and Catholic workers. For over two years the important repercussions resulting from this affirmation of our good intentions have strengthened the French People’s Front.”

This is particularly significant because it underscores the international dimensions of this effort. None of the national communist parties, in America and especially France, did anything without the order and coordination of Moscow.³⁷⁶ There is no doubt that Moscow would have been in support of this effort, if not directing it and organizing it, and above all approving of it.

As for France giving this a big push, if not the first push, that is hardly a surprise for France, where there was always a huge number of communists (and socialists). By the end of World War II, the two largest political parties in France were run by the communists and the socialists. Prior to even when Marx and Engels first met there, France was fertile ground for communists—and not just from Europe. The likes of Pol Pot and his leading Khmer Rouge cadres from Cambodia got their start in France, where an innocent, non-ideological, non-political Pot first arrived as a foreign student to study “radio-electricity” before being radicalized and returning to his native country in Southeast Asia as a genocidal Marxist maniac. Right through the end of the Cold War, the Kremlin’s largest annual subsidies to foreign communist parties went to France and the United States.³⁷⁷ The Comintern concentrated so heavily on the United States because a victory there could be the grandest of all, albeit elusive. Lenin, as early as 1918, had written his provocative *Letter to American Workers*. The Comintern concentrated on France not only because it, too, would be a grand victory but because it, unlike the United States, seemed a far more likely prospect for Marxist victory.

It was there, in October 1937, that Maurice Thorez, leader of France's Communist Party, made his "outstretched hand" effort to the nation's Catholics. This had been especially fruitful, said Communist Party USA, in the "great trade union movement in France." CPUSA held out hopes that the same might transpire in the United States, particularly with Catholic workingmen and immigrants in industries from rail and steel to textiles and in groups like the C.I.O. and A.F. of L., where millions of Catholics marched side by side (including in strikes) "with their brothers of all political shades and religious creeds." Perhaps what happened in France could happen in America.³⁷⁸

The France example deserves a moment of pause. The key figure in France's popular front—the *front populaire* or *Le Populaire*—was Albert Vassart, who in 1934 coined that expression as a new slogan of French communists. Vassart is a crucial figure in this history, as we will see again in coming pages. He was no less than the French representative to the Comintern, a loyal son—until he broke with Moscow and the party in 1939 because of the Hitler-Stalin Pact.³⁷⁹

In France, the Communist Party and Socialist Party had been bitter foes, but suddenly in the spring of 1934 the Comintern began seeking a rapprochement for a *Le Populaire*. Vassart would head the effort. Such an effort would be, he soon learned, his principle task upon being summoned to Moscow in April 1934. The Comintern instructed comrade Vassart that it was imperative to band together the largest number of people in France possible to rally against fascism in a broad united front. "It is as simple as ABC," he was told by Dmitri Manuilsky, one of the top Comintern officials from the time of Lenin to Stalin. "We need a vast rallying together. We cannot stop with Socialists." Stalin himself had made this change to the party line.³⁸⁰

The French Socialist Party and Communist Party jostled back and forth but, nonetheless, fairly quickly worked out an agreement. The Socialist Party, Vassart later remembered, was surprised at how "the Communist Party leadership suddenly had become all sugar and honey." Within the next few weeks, by July 13, 1934, they had a deal.³⁸¹

As Vassart would later note, the goal was not only to fight fascism in France. By the end of 1933, the USSR was seeking closer diplomatic ties with the Western democracies. This was being pursued in order to (in

Vassart's words) "enable the Communist parties in the respective countries to put pressure on their governments to pursue a pro-Soviet policy."³⁸²

America was far from excluded from this Soviet effort—quite the contrary. Franklin Roosevelt was lobbied hard, by the Kremlin, by Earl Browder, by communists operating secretly from within his administration, and by duped liberals throughout his administration and within the Democratic Party. FDR ultimately responded positively to this push for formal diplomatic relations with Stalin's totalitarian dictatorship. He became the first president to officially recognize Stalin's USSR, after a long line of previous presidents, from the liberal Woodrow Wilson through three Republican presidents, had all vehemently rejected the Soviet request. They all adamantly opposed it; Roosevelt, however, embraced Stalin with open arms.³⁸³

That warmth by FDR (and his wife) inspired Browder and his band to seek a wider popular front among the broader political left in America. Having had great success coddling Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, as well as key White House aides like Harry Hopkins, an emboldened CPUSA made a bid for American Catholics. Given that so many Catholics were Democrats and FDR supporters, including the likes of Cardinal Spellman, it might not have seemed a long shot. Still, given they and their Church's principled anti-communism, it was indeed a long shot.

That brings us back to Browder's May–June 1938 speech and booklet, *A Message to Catholics*. Browder and CPUSA made an appeal to Catholic workingmen and immigrants, especially those in union organizations like the C.I.O. and A.F. of L., insisting that "the Communist Party heartily agrees" with "progressive Catholic sentiments" that stand in solidarity with working people.³⁸⁴ Browder and the CPUSA National Committee presented their offer to Catholics, appealing to "democracy." "Within the camp of democracy," asserted Browder, "are included the great majority of the members of the Catholic Church. We communists extend the hand of brotherly cooperation to them, and express our pleasure to find ourselves fighting shoulder to shoulder with them for the same economic and social aims."³⁸⁵

This claim of shoulder-to-shoulder aims could not have been a more gross misrepresentation. There may have been similar desires for higher employment, more welfare, poverty reduction, a more "equitable" wealth

redistribution, a smaller income gap, but a careful read of the *Communist Manifesto* or anything by Lenin and Stalin showed no similarities whatsoever with the language of the Old and New Testaments or the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. This point deserves a little more elaboration here, because it is based on a surprisingly common assertion by “social justice” and progressive Christians to this day—namely, that communism and socialism have attractive similarities with Christianity, and thus should not be dismissed by Christians. No, no, and no. That is a very foolish and shallow conclusion, one that results from a great ignorance of the actual teachings and texts of communism.

The fact that certain passages of the Old and New Testaments, or certain religious orders, express forms of communalism or sharing or helping the poor or even pooling together of common resources does not, *ipso facto*, mean that those ancient or medieval elements were practicing the nineteenth-century ideology that would become known as “communism.” In these cases, from the Acts of the Apostles to, say, the Franciscans, those societies or orders were first and foremost forged on a Christian model; it was religion that served as their anchor, their rudder, their guiding, inspiring, motivating, animating, higher force—the very spiritual force that communism ridicules, rejects, and seeks to abolish. Read any writing by Marx or Engels or Lenin and contrast it with any writing by or about, say, Jesus Christ or the Apostle Paul or St. Francis (sometimes cited by communists and progressive Christians). One will immediately notice that they are completely different in every meaningful respect, irrespective of whether they share a specific commonality such as sharing of resources or giving up property—which, notably, is a fully voluntary choice and endeavor for any Franciscan (for instance) who chooses to join the order, and which is not voluntary for the 100 percent of individuals compelled by the coercive hand of the state in totalitarian communist societies. Moreover, the Bible repeatedly offers vigorous defenses of private property and property rights,³⁸⁶ as rudimentary as the understanding implicit in the Ten Commandments laid down by the Creator: *thou shalt not steal*. To steal is to take someone’s property, which is a sacred and natural right according to both biblical law and natural law. The assertion by Marx and Engels that “the entire communist program may be summed up in the single sentence: abolition of private property” is completely antithetical to the teachings of

God. It is a foundational violation of one of the most basic precepts of Judeo-Christian thought and life.

We could go on and on with such examples. In the New Testament, individuals like the Good Samaritan or Zacchaeus or the vineyard owner all voluntarily give their own wealth or earnings as free-will acts of benevolence, not as forced responses to state fiat.

Thus, for communists in the 1930s to try to argue that Catholics or Christians generally should join hands with them because both sides believed in protecting the worker would be to ignore the far more significant and vast differences that permanently separate the two sides. It would be like witches and warlocks trying to reach out to Catholics and Christians because each side, after all, has a spiritual element. It would be like Aztecs trying to reach out to Catholics and Christians because each side, after all, saw certain value in human sacrifice. It would be like Satanists assuring Catholics and Christians that they, too, have a master. And even more relevant to the discussion here in this chapter, it would be like fascists in the 1930s reaching out to Catholics and Christians because, after all, they loved their country just as Franco and Mussolini and even Hitler loved theirs. I choose that particular example because Browder and the Comintern and Moscow all were seeking to reach out to Catholics and Christians in the 1930s precisely in part to help them oppose fascism in Spain and Italy and Germany. That was intrinsic to this effort. (This is clear in reading the full text of the 1937 CPUSA letter, as well as reading Browder's 1938 speech and letter to Catholics.)

Again, the few areas of potential partial agreement between communists and Catholics and Christians could not reconcile or bridge the wider ocean of vast differences, especially given the communist rejection of God and Jesus Christ.

Earl Browder knew that, but he also knew, as he said in his next line, that one-sixth of all Americans were Catholic, and hence to attract even a sliver to the communist cause would have been an enormous coup to CPUSA—ballooning that wider network of allies constituting a “popular front.” That was the goal, and thus Browder and the boys did their best to try to claim areas of commonality. One could see Browder practically salivating on his typewriter as he noted that there were “over 20 million Catholics” in the United States. In fact, in a most revealing admission, he wrote, “It must be admitted that they [Catholics] are many and we are few,

that as compared with over twenty million Catholics there are less than 10 per cent of that number of Communists and their sympathizers.”³⁸⁷

Precisely.

Browder continued in his speech and letter, sweetly insisting that “the conflict between Catholics and Communists ... is not of our choosing at all, and which, insofar as it exists, is founded on misunderstanding and misinformation. We want to clear away all misunderstanding, and refute all misinterpretation, in the interests of brotherly social relationships.”³⁸⁸

Of course, perhaps a good starting point for easing conflict would be for Browder’s international comrades to stop jailing and killing Catholics around the world. No doubt such unfortunate activities, *insofar as they existed*, of course, hindered brotherly love.

Then again, Chairman Browder would have begged to differ, or at least feigned innocence. He betrayed complete shock that anyone could ever suspect communists of disliking religion, let alone the religious. “Communists scrupulously respect all religious beliefs,” Browder insisted, “and avoid all offense against them, firmly upholding complete religious freedom and toleration.”³⁸⁹

This, of course, was a massive whopper. Undeterred, Browder continued weaving all sorts of ludicrously and obviously false claims, such as how communists, like Catholics, were magnificent advocates of the family. “The Communists are staunch upholders of the family,” he explained, never bothering to quote infamous lines like that of Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*: “Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists.”³⁹⁰

But alas, comrade Browder was not sharing any exhortations from the *Manifesto* in his valentine to Catholics. Such admonitions simply did not seem worth raising at the time. That was not quite the spirit of the moment.

Browder plowed ahead line after line with such bunkum, pivoting from America to Spain to the USSR with fib after fib, no doubt leaving Catholic readers alternately bemused and outraged. When his missive reached Rome, the pope must have fallen off his chair from laughter or from a heart attack. The Chair of St. Peter no doubt saw in Chairman Browder yet another sad son of the Father of Lies. What Browder was revealing was not only his penchant for deceiving Catholics but also his view of them as slack-jawed

ignoramus. Truly no one would swallow this bucket of hogwash. One wonders if even the Right Rev. Harry Ward blushed.

Nonetheless, Earl Browder was deadly serious. He gave it one heck of a shot.

“We extend the hand of brotherly cooperation to the great mass of democratic Catholics,” Browder concluded.³⁹¹

Catholics Reject the “Outstretched Hand”

Catholics rejected this bilge shoveled by the outstretched hand of Earl Browder. That is unsurprising given the leadership of their Church on this issue. That Catholic rejection was so clear as to require little need of further proof in these pages. An obvious example are the statements cited in this book from the Vatican and various popes denouncing communism. It harkens back to the Church’s encyclicals describing communists as wolves in sheep’s clothing. Communists might talk brotherhood and kindness, but meanwhile in secret they bound their victims. Recall the very first encyclical, *Qui Pluribus*, by Pius IX in 1846. Communism, said Pius IX, was a “dark design” of “men in the clothing of sheep, while inwardly ravening wolves.” “After taking their captives gently, they mildly bind them, and then kill them in secret.” They are “filled with deceit and cunning” and “spread pestilential doctrines everywhere and deprave the minds especially of the imprudent, occasioning great losses for religion.”

Had Earl Browder been alive in 1846, the Vatican could have posted his photo next to that passage in the encyclical. In fact, truth be told, Browder was just one example of innumerable swindlers who served the communist cause. William Z. Foster or Gus Hall or any everyday Soviet apparatchik would have done the same. It would all be funny if not for the painful reality that communists did not just lie to people but persecuted them, imprisoned them, tortured them, murdered them.

Many American Catholics, however, did know better and spurned this twisted olive branch. Fulton Sheen and Cardinal Spellman, countless politicians and lay people, knew that their faith and communism were irreconcilable. At the time of Browder’s request, the *New York Times* ran a reply to Browder from the New York Chapter of the National Catholic Alumni Federation, which quoted from papal encyclicals to “show the Catholic Church has never been conciliatory toward communism.”³⁹²

Fulton Sheen responded at great length, prompted by a challenge from Louis Budenz. Budenz had written in the *Daily Worker* a lengthy piece posing eight questions to Monsignor Sheen, then a professor of philosophy at the Catholic University of America, and not yet a TV star, albeit well-known for his radio show, his writing, and his lecturing. Sheen was already a force to be reckoned with, which is why Budenz endeavored to take him on. Sheen responded to each question in detail, answering them with communist sources—in other words, taking the words straight from the horse’s mouth. Sheen’s answers would be published in a small book by the Paulist Press, titled *Communism Answers Questions of a Communist*.³⁹³

This was an impressive refutation by Sheen, pulling and listing quote after quote from the likes of Lenin to Lenin’s widow, from Stalin to Dimitrov, Litvinoff, Radek, and Browder, plus a remarkable gathering of statements printed in *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, and current Soviet publications, all responding to Budenz’s claims about communism and the poor, the unemployed, the family,³⁹⁴ democracy, Spain, modern Russia, fascism, racism, Hitler, the Ku Klux Klan, and on and on.

Among Budenz’s challenges was this one to Sheen: “We invite you and the Catholic people to join in a united fight for the preservation of democratic rights and against the black danger of Fascism. Cooperating with those who have ever been in the front ranks in this fight for democracy.”³⁹⁵

Here was the outstretched hand. In short time, of course, communism would violate this fight against fascism when Stalin joined hands with Hitler—something that Sheen would be among the first to predict shortly before it happened, to the shocked horror of many Jewish American communists.³⁹⁶ But that aside, Sheen already knew better. He knew that Budenz and others were trotting out the “democracy” canard and (as Sheen put it) “that bogey ‘Fascism’ again.” Sheen stated, “Let us stick to the facts. Thanks for the invitation, but we Catholics and all Americans must decline the invitation to the ‘United Front’ and why? Simply because it is a front. A front is a camouflage and deceit to be removed when it has served its purpose.” Precisely that transpired when Stalin and Hitler signed their pact in August 1939 jointly launching World War II with their mutual invasions of Poland that September.

Sheen continued, “Communism has two faces: one it shows in Russia where it is established, the other it shows to the rest of the world where it hopes to be established. ‘United Front,’ ‘Popular Front’ merely mean new tactics are used to present or to disguise the same revolutionary philosophy which has enslaved Russia.” Here, too, Sheen quoted Soviet sources, including Dimitrov’s work *The Working Class Against Fascism*, which cynically advised that communists in public “suppress the language of revolution, but not revolutionary intentions” and “give the people only as much Communism as they will absorb any given moment.” Dimitrov recommended (in Sheen’s words) “the drawing of a red herring across the path of the people—namely, Fascism.”

Thus, the very real threat of fascism was being used by communists as a tool to try to draw the wider masses to the side of communism and the “democratic rights” it supposedly loved. “The new disguises of the United and Popular Fronts do not mean that Communism has given up any of its revolutionary or atheistic principles,” Sheen concluded, “it only means it has camouflaged them.” This was a “tactic,” merely a “new procedure,” to advance the aims of the revolution—and this time aimed at attempting to attract Catholics. Fulton Sheen wasn’t buying it.³⁹⁷

“No!” said Sheen emphatically. “We Catholics cannot join your United Front because we have found you out. We know the Front is only a front, and we think the less of Communism for insulting our intelligence. ... [W]e must reject the proposal of those who would betray our liberties with the kiss of Judas.” He added, “May we make a suggestion to the Communists? Now that we know your ‘new front’ is only a front, why not give it up? After all, every disguise becomes ineffective as soon as it is known to be a disguise. Masquerades always fail when one knows who is behind the mask. Why not be honest and assert Communism as it is?” He quoted Soviet documents noting the Comintern’s call for a worldwide “civil war” in each nation in order to replace governments like those in America with communist dictatorships.

Sheen finished, “You invite Catholics to join in Communism to ‘fight for the preservation of democratic rights and against the black danger of Fascism.’ Fascism may be the black danger, but Communism is the red one.” Sheen brilliantly suggested that communists change the name of one of their slickest front groups, the League Against War and Fascism, to the

“League Against War, Fascism and Communism,” and then, he said, “we will join.”³⁹⁸

The monsignor’s evisceration of Dimitrov was classic Fulton Sheen.

The Catholic Worker Steps Up

One striking rebuke of the outstretched hand that will surprise many Catholics today was the swift response by Dorothy Day’s *Catholic Worker*. The front page of the September 1938 issue of the *Catholic Worker* featured a long retort by the editors to Earl Browder’s offer.³⁹⁹ It was an extended, thoughtful response, concluding with an emphatic accompanying statement that “Catholics May Not Join C.P.”

“Dear Brother Browder,” the letter from the *Catholic Worker* began. “As rank and file lay Catholics ... we welcome your ‘Message to Catholics.’ We, too, are interested in eliminating falsehood and bitterness between Catholics and Communists. ... We also understand that many wealthy Catholics side with the reactionary camp in politics.” Starting with that olive branch, and a gesture toward a little common ground, the editors then said, “Yet let us place first things first. We cannot subscribe to a philosophy both materialistic and atheistic in essence which finds no room for the divine element in solving the social and economic problem.” The editors explained that man is not matter alone but spirit and matter. “Therefore we cannot admit of any putting aside of religious belief, ethics or family morality because they are the essential and natural norms of human conduct—to destroy or to distort these norms is to eliminate the essential standards whereby man can ascertain the validity of his actions.”

This latter point would be a focus of the philosophical work of a budding Catholic scholar and future pope named John Paul II, who at this point was a teen in Krakow, Poland. Karol Wojtyla would title his work on this subject *Person and Act*, also variously translated as *The Acting Person*, a central thrust of which is that man chooses his actions, and those actions must be pursued according to standards and ethics prescribed by a divine and loving God.⁴⁰⁰ We can ascertain the validity of our actions only through choosing in accordance with the precepts of the Christian faith. The principle problem with communism was its atheism and rejection of any such precepts and, indeed, of the very notion of a Creator and of biblical and natural law.

Digging into questions of determinism versus free will, the editors at the *Catholic Worker* noted to Browder and his cohorts that “history is not merely the interaction of blind economic forces.” Then came this sledgehammer from the *Catholic Worker*, which ought to be remembered by friends and foes of Dorothy Day alike: “We Christians love Communists as human beings and potential fellows in Christ’s Mystical Body but we hate Communism. Yet, you Communists hate capitalists as well as capitalism. We love men, hate their sins. You hate sinners against the ‘Party Line.’”

For these reasons, the editors summed up, “That is why we say that Communism is intrinsically in error and no one who would save civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever. We cannot accept your outstretched hand for these reasons. ... We believe that this makes it quite definite that no true Catholic can be a member of the Communist Party.”

That bears repeating for any (hopefully very rare) pro-communist Catholics today: In the words of Dorothy Day’s *Catholic Worker*, “no true Catholic can be a member of the Communist Party.”

The letter was signed by Richard L. G. Deverall, editor of the *Christian Front*, and William M. Callahan, managing editor of the *Catholic Worker*. Published on the front page of the newspaper as an “Open Letter To Browder By Editors,” it clearly represented the opinion of the editorial staff of the *Catholic Worker*, which no doubt surely included Dorothy Day, the newspaper’s founder in 1933 and editor until her death nearly fifty years later.

This elegant, strong response by Day’s *Catholic Worker*, widely perceived to this day as left-leaning and soft on communism, is further illustration of the universal, stern rejection of the offer made by Browder and Communist Party USA. In all, it signaled to American communists what they already knew: they would have a devil of a time trying to hoodwink American Catholics to their cause.

That being the case, they doubled down on Protestants. They turned their attention still more vigorously to liberal Protestants, especially in the mainline denominations, particularly Episcopalians and Methodists.

Of course, that does not mean that communists fully abandoned the mission of trying to make inroads with Catholics, and even pursue methods of infiltration.

J. B. Matthews on the Outstretched Hand and United Front

Lastly, one of the single best testimonies to the surreptitious motivations behind this effort was provided by J. B. Matthews in his prodigious work and research. Matthews became one of the leading experts, including for the federal government, on the machinations of the far left in America. Much could be quoted here from Matthews (two of his major reports are cited elsewhere in this book), but our interest lies in a key snapshot from this period: his 1938 memoir *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*. This was written at the height of the outstretched hand and united front strategy.⁴⁰¹

As the title conveys, Dr. Matthews had been a self-described “fellow traveler of the communists”—a socialist who formed a partnership with communists, eventually morphing into some form of the latter. A professor and linguist, with particular expertise in Sanskrit and Asian languages, he was one of the leading organizers for the united front and for creating front groups, such as the American League Against War and Fascism, for which he was the national chairman. He was also an active pacifist and an early ACLU member. In Manhattan, in 1929, he formally joined the Socialist Party, for which he was a prominent, outspoken figure. He worked closely with communists, to the point that fellow socialists thought he was secretly a member of the American Communist Party. He eventually joined the Revolutionary Policy Committee, a group of self-described “revolutionary socialists.” He was described warmly as a “comrade” and “conscious Communist sympathizer” by the likes of Jay Lovestone, a leading communist of the day. In 1932, he became a “full-fledged fellow traveler” and organizer for the united front.⁴⁰²

Matthews’s pro-Soviet bona fides became further evident that year. During that summer of 1932, he capped off his fifth visit to the Soviet Union in five years—making him no ordinary fellow traveler. He was soaking in what the Rev. Harry Ward glowingly called “the Soviet spirit.” Matthews traveled up and down the Ukraine that year, where he amazingly denied the very famine before his eyes, and came home rejecting its existence in articles he penned for the *Daily Worker*. Matthews had become a Soviet stooge. He wasn’t merely drinking the Kool-Aid; he was guzzling it.

Matthews nonetheless hung his coat in the Socialist Party closet rather than that of CPUSA. He was in demand as a leading socialist thinker and

speaker, right up there with the likes of religious left stalwart Reinhold Niebuhr, another radical leftist professor at Union Theological Seminary (like the Rev. Harry Ward), who, to his credit, later became a prominent progressive theologian who was anti-communist and anti-Soviet. Matthews was second only to Norman Thomas in speeches given around the country for the Socialist Party.

Without digressing too much from our focus here on Matthews, an important note or two is worthwhile on the case of Norman Thomas.

Thomas was arguably the most well-known socialist of the twentieth century, the only competitor being Eugene Debs, from whom Thomas picked up the Socialist Party mantle after Debs's death in 1926. From there, Thomas, who had already run for various elected offices as the Socialist Party candidate in New York, began a run of six Socialist Party nominations for president of the United States, starting in 1928.

Though many today know that Norman Thomas was probably the most famous and successful socialist in American history, few know (and many will be surprised to learn) that Thomas was not merely religious, and a Christian, but was actually an ordained Presbyterian minister. He had graduated from Princeton in 1908 and decided to study for the ministry, following the footsteps of both his father and grandfather. Unfortunately, rather than attending an orthodox Presbyterian seminary, as his father had wanted, he opted instead for the UTS theological crazy house: Union Theological Seminary in New York. It was there that Thomas was seduced by the left's "social gospel." He was so liberal even then that conservatives in the Presbyterian Church tried to introduce heresy charges against him (for, among other reasons, denying the virgin birth of Christ) and prevent him from being ordained. They failed. He was ordained in January 1911. Conservatives merely needed to be more patient, as Thomas eventually and effectively de-ordained himself—from the ministry and the Christian faith altogether. "Although Thomas did not formally demit the ministry until Oct. 5, 1931," writes one scholar, "he made his final break with the Christian church near the end of 1921."⁴⁰³

But the main point here is this: Norman Thomas, famous socialist, was once a Presbyterian minister, and yet another dubious product of Union Theological Seminary, a theological looney-bin that did great damage to Protestant Christianity. Atheist socialists and communists alike knew they had plenty of friends at UTS, which was, in essence, like a seminary

version of Columbia University—a hotbed for targeting and recruiting and duping.⁴⁰⁴

It was this milieu that J. B. Matthews, as a religious socialist, knew so well in the 1920s.

Matthews ultimately became a Marxist, if not a CPUSA member. “I had become not only a Marxist but a confirmed exponent of the united front,” he wrote.⁴⁰⁵ That, along with his impeccable Socialist Party credentials, made him ideal for helping to hammer out a “united front” comprised of a wider swath of leftists. He said of himself, “No other person in the United States had such an impressive united front record.”⁴⁰⁶ Matthews gave all his time, heart, mind, and energy to every silly communist-socialist-“progressive” cause and activity under the sun. Reading them all in his memoirs is painful. One winces at how leftists like Matthews truly devoted their lives and souls to so many insane and ultimately malicious causes.⁴⁰⁷

And yet, J. B. Matthews came to see the light, eventually becoming one of the leading defectors from the far left in America in the 1930s. He was destined to become ex-red persona non grata as he began exposing the comrades and blowing the whistle. His book in 1938, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, was his most in-depth personal effort.

Matthews began that treatment by illuminating communists’ ruse of betraying Christianity with a kiss while subtly infiltrating churches. He quoted Earl Browder conceding to students of Union Theological Seminary on February 15, 1935: “You may be interested in knowing that we have preachers, preachers active in churches, who are members of the Communist Party.”⁴⁰⁸ Browder had bragged, “We could recite a thousand local examples of the successful application of the united front tactic initiated by the Communist Party.”⁴⁰⁹ Matthews was not divulging any secrets from behind closed doors. He was quoting directly from Browder’s speech to UTS students, which Browder and the Party candidly published in his 1935 manifesto *Communism in the United States*.

As Matthews thus attested, Browder’s about-faced out-stretched hand was simply a tactic to hoodwink the gullible. Matthews quoted one of the leading Soviet officials of the Kremlin and its Comintern, Manuilsky: “Tactics, generally, may change, but the general line of the Communist International, the course it is steering for the proletarian revolution ...

remains unchanged. ... Only downright scoundrels ... and hopeless idiots can think that by means of the United Front tactics Communism is capitulating to social democracy.”⁴¹⁰

Truly, only an idiot.

The about-face for the outstretched hand was a two-faced tactical maneuver. That, too, reflected communist thinking about *morality*, as defined by Papa Lenin himself. Recall that Lenin had stated that the “only morality” that communists recognize is that which furthers class interests.

Picking up with that Leninist-communist *ethic*, J. B. Matthews noted that, consistent with the party’s and Moscow’s and Lenin’s “communist code of ethics,” religion was to be exploited for class gain, even if that involved blatant deception. “It is not surprising to find the Communist Party in the United States engaged in a systematic effort to lure the churches,” averred Matthews, “especially the Catholic Church, into the net of the Party’s united fronts. Such duplicity transcends the bounds of understanding on the part of those who are not acquainted with the Communist Party’s clear pronouncements on the churches and religion.” Here Matthews quoted Browder at the tenth annual Communist Party convention: “We extend the hand of fellowship to our Catholic brothers.”⁴¹¹

Matthews noted how the *Daily Worker* had started the propagandizing a few months earlier, ahead of Browder’s big-lie rollout at the big convention. “It is not, and never has been and never will be,” insisted the *Worker* with a whopper, “the objective of Communism to wage a religious war against those who believe in God or who hold any other religious faith.”⁴¹²

Hmm. Now there was a switch—obviously tactical to anyone but the really, really, really gullible (of which there were too many). Matthews responded by quoting four statements from current communist literature, pamphlets, and books still in bookstores, which the comrades had not bothered to yank from the shelves, replete with timeless gems like these:

“It is necessary to link the fight against the church and religion with the fight against capitalism and imperialism.”⁴¹³

“The Soviet Union under a workers’ and peasants’ government is the only country in the world where religion and the churches are being combated with the active cooperation of the government.”⁴¹⁴

“The unaltering determination of the Communists to do away with religion and the inclusion of this aim [is] one of the chief features of the educational system from one end of the country

[the USSR] to the other.”⁴¹⁵

“The Red Army is one of the most active centers for the dissemination of atheism. Its recruits are given systematic instruction in anti-religious theory just as they are in other Communist doctrines.”⁴¹⁶

The latter two nuggets were produced by longtime Columbia University professor Corliss Lamont, pal of Professor John Dewey, founding father of American public education, and one of the worst “progressive” agitators for the communist cause in American history. Corliss was another fellow traveler to the USSR (if not a formal CPUSA member), from which he returned sporting (among other things) a proud pin and insignia of Trotsky’s and Lenin’s League of the Militant Godless.⁴¹⁷ Surely when Corliss talked to his religious left friends, however, he sang a different tune when it came to religion—literal hosannas.

As Matthews noted, those four quotes alone ought to have satisfied even the most incredulous into realizing that when Browder and the boys offered the outstretched hand, it was really a backhand. And shame on them if they didn’t see the slap behind the greeting.

Matthews further quoted Browder’s own words openly published just two years earlier in his book *What Is Communism?* There, Browder had affirmed, “We communists do not distinguish between good and bad religions, because we think they are all bad for the masses.” Matthews quoted a telling statement from communists in their cynical rationale for seeking the creation of united front groups with religious organizations: “It is significant that the Communist Party, more than any other labor group, has been able to achieve successful united fronts with church groups on the most important issues of the day. This is not due to any compromise with religion as such, on our part. In fact, by going among the religious masses, we are for the first time able to bring our anti-religious ideas to them.”⁴¹⁸

Note the double intention among the deceivers: In addition to thriving amid a sea of facilitated confusion, to hoodwink the religious to the communists’ ultimate anti-religious cause, they might also dupe the religious into eventually becoming anti-religious themselves—confusing them about their own beliefs in God. They could bring to the religious the communists’ anti-religious gospel, carefully preaching the ideas not of Christ but of anti-Christ. This could be done by getting all leftists—religious and anti-religious—into one large room (or maybe even church)

together. Thus, the united front strategy could pay off handsome double dividends. One can almost picture the devil laughing at the very cunning of it all. And to think that it often worked.

J. B. Matthews noted how the *Daily Worker* marked the following Christmas 1937 by publishing a warm and fuzzy article heralding the wonderful similarities between communism and Christianity. This prompted for weeks thereafter warm and fuzzy “letters to the editor” from (alleged) readers around the nation impressed by the outstretched hand and its benevolent gesture of goodwill to Catholics. One “writer,” someone from Detroit listed with the name “Comrade H. G.,” celebrated how the new outstretched hand had helped him draw two new couples into the party—Christmas-time converts. Comrade H. G. further enthused, “And now that the *Daily Worker* has printed the statement from the Pope on accepting the Communist offer of the ‘outstretched hand,’ it’ll be a snap to recruit.”⁴¹⁹

J. B. Matthews hastened to add, “Precisely when the Pope accepted the ‘outstretched hand’ of the Communist Party, it would take the *Daily Worker*, with its genius for mendacity, to say.” Indeed, it would. When had Pope Pius XI done that? Had Comrade H. G. taken a glance at the pope’s recently released *Divini Redemptoris* (On Atheistic Communism)—that is, the printed statement describing communism as a “satanic scourge” and its disciples (like the folks at the *Daily Worker*) as the “sons of darkness?” Apparently not. Then again, when did truth ever matter to these marvels of mendacity?

The *Daily Worker* was now describing Jesus as a fellow “real revolutionary” and “proletarian fighter.”⁴²⁰ Alas, a good Jesus—a *communist* Jesus. A political messiah. Precisely what Jesus Christ told Pontius Pilate he was not.

And yet, the sad reality, as Matthews knew, is that too many progressive Christians fell for this nonsense. They were not wise as serpents.

In all, said J. B. Matthews, it would more than surprise many modern politicians, newspaper editors, and public officials to find the sudden existence of so many “Methodist comrades, Baptist comrades, Presbyterian comrades.” Nonetheless, he and other fellow travelers and former communists were not surprised at all. They had watched them all in action. They had watched the comrades sow the seed, seed which had taken hold and developed roots in many a Marxist mission field.⁴²¹

Unfortunate future generations, and, yes, many churches and Christian institutions, would reap the harvest and the whirlwind.

CHAPTER 9

“OBLITERATING ALL RELIGION”

LOUIS BUDENZ AND BEN GITLOW SPEAK OUT

As communists sought to enter the churches of Christendom, they simultaneously sought to set them ablaze—and not merely metaphorically. In the USSR and throughout the communist world, churches were ignited, dynamited, obliterated. As communists in the West assured Christians that they wanted to shake hands with them, communists in the East and elsewhere handcuffed them and blew up their churches.

To say that communists wanted to obliterate religion was no mere matter of expression. In places like Bolshevik Russia, it was a literal process.

The desire to smash religion was shared by communists in America, even if it did not descend to the level of Marxist kingpins ordering in the wrecking balls to the nation’s cathedrals. Mercifully, Marxists never seized the reins of power in the United States. We were spared their wrecking balls, at least physical ones.

But while America’s communists could not get their arms around church edifices, they did their best to take a metaphorical ax to religious belief where and when they could. They knew which religion was their most vexing foe. That knowledge was displayed in one particularly striking line from the November 1946 testimony of erstwhile American communist leader Louis Budenz, who said of the Catholic Church in particular but also

of religion generally, “The Communists everywhere plan to wage war on the Catholic Church as the base for obliterating all religion.”

What Budenz said was backed more strongly and widely—regarding Christendom more broadly—by the likes of other former leading American communists—in particular, Ben Gitlow. Gitlow spoke to American Christianity generally, particularly the mainline Protestant denominations.

What Budenz and Gitlow warned about is distressing to this day.

“War Upon the Catholic Church”

Louis Budenz was a top American communist in the 1930s. He would also become a leading ex-communist, and an ex-atheist.

Recall that it was Budenz who, in the *Daily Worker*, had openly challenged Fulton Sheen to prove that communists were against religion. Sheen took up that challenge with typical panache. Budenz was so won over by Sheen’s arguments that he ultimately became one of the era’s most well-known converts of Sheen. Yes, Fulton Sheen brought Louis Budenz into the Catholic Church, back to the faith of his youth. Quite remarkably, almost hilariously, the priest managed to bring Budenz back into the fold while the *Daily Worker* editor’s name was still on the newspaper’s masthead. If the comrades around the office had known that, well, you could have probably heard them howl from the other side of the Brooklyn Bridge. Sheen brought Budenz into the Church along with his wife and three daughters.⁴²²

By the mid-1940s, Budenz was ready to offer some serious public penance for his past sins with communism. This included his important testimony before Congress on November 22, 1946.

By this point, the former managing editor of the *Daily Worker*, the official newspaper of Communist Party USA, had left the party and become an assistant professor of economics at Fordham University and at the University of Notre Dame. He had been a party member for ten years, six of which he served prominently as a member of the national committee.⁴²³

Budenz recounted those details in his testimony. He also spoke to (among other things) what he called “the present tactics of the Communists in regard to the Catholics.” He had come to Washington that day in part to call attention to those tactics.⁴²⁴ Budenz stated:

I mentioned also the question of the Catholic Church, and I raise that because today it is a question that is of concern to every American, and it's part of the tactics of Communists as I learned them. I was one of those who were fooled into believing that in America there could be cooperation between the Communists and the Catholics.

I found that was considered undesirable from the Communist viewpoint, but beyond that I learned toward my latter days in the Communist Party from material I read in the *New Times*, which is now the name of the Communist International magazine, that the Communists everywhere plan to wage war on the Catholic Church as the base for obliterating all religion.

Budenz also noted that certain Protestants (including communists posing as Protestants) were exploited in this strategy. He said that this policy had been outlined in an article by a left-wing Protestant publication, titled simply *Protestant* magazine. "This policy was developed in an article to which I shall call your attention setting forth the ideas that I learned," said Budenz, "namely, of the program to arouse the Protestants against the Catholics in this country as a means of causing confusion in the United States."

Budenz generously said that he had "enough confidence in the American Protestants to know that that is not going to succeed, but I have to point to this because it is in black and white in an official article." The article actually had been "worked up" by one of Budenz's comrades from CPUSA's political committee, clearly showing that there were intimate connections between the party and this Protestant publication. Budenz stated:

I knew about this before I left, and pointed to it very temperately in my statement as I left. This matter was presented to me in a conference by the comrade who worked up the material for this article for the political committee. He advised me the aim was to extend the work of the *Protestant* magazine. That is a magazine whose name is "Protestant," but which is engaged largely in being anti-Catholic and the responsible Jewish organizations have recently condemned it, as you may know. That view of the extension of the *Protestant* work against Catholics was confirmed by this article of V. J. Jerome in *Political Affairs* in April 1946, in which he links up the Catholic Church with American imperialism, and in which he shows what he calls the great wealth of the Catholic Church and says there has been no sufficient Protestant reaction. That immediately tells the comrades to go out and pose as Protestants and arouse that reaction, for when a Communist reads an article he puts it into action. In this article the recent attack on Cardinal Spellman by the Communist councilmen in New York City was endorsed as being proper Communist tactics when it was feasible to do so. In other words, here is outlined a program which is directly opposed to the alleged outstretched-hand idea which the Communists formerly said they stood for when they needed to rally everybody, including the Catholics, to the defense of the Soviet Union against the efficient German war machine. This renewed program of war upon the Catholic Church is contained in the April 1946 issue of *Political Affairs* as part of their tactics within the United States today.

From there, Budenz's comments went to the matter of religion generally, prompted by the chairman of the committee, Congressman Rankin, who

asked, “Mr. Budenz, is it not a fact that communism is opposed to all kinds of religion?” Budenz answered, “That is correct. A totalitarian regime, especially one built on the materialistic interpretation of history, cannot permit any organization of religion except as a servile tool of the all-powerful state.” Rankin asked Budenz if Karl Marx’s infamous assessment, “Religion is the opium of the people,” was “Communist doctrine ... before you went into the party, and all the time you were in the party.” Budenz replied:

That was the principle, although, you see at that time they had the policy of the outstretched hand, which was the result of the People’s Front Policy and they contended that they wanted cooperation between all religions and the Communists, or specifically the Catholics and the Communists.

However, I would like to say this to sort of bring this to a point: The fact of the matter is, those who sought collaboration, like myself as an individual, as one member of the party, did so on the basis that this outstretched-hand policy would lead to better relationship between the two groups, and that was roughly in line with the policy of the Communists at that time.

Now, it was written by Elizabeth Flynn in the *Daily Worker* at the time I left the party that you could have any religion you chose and remain in the Communist Party. That is not true. You cannot have any religion, except where you are in a particular religion and it serves the purpose of the party to keep you there. Even there, as Lenin pointed out, the party must fight religious ideology. The leaders of the party are not permitted to hold any religious belief.

As further proof of this, Budenz invoked the statement of Gilbert Green at the 1935 convention of the Communist International—the Comintern’s so-called People’s Front convention. In that statement, said Budenz, which represented the policy of America’s Young Communist League, headed by Green, Green pointed out that when his fellow communist youth came into association with religious youth, they did allow these youth to continue to go to church, but in such a way as not to interfere with “our atheistic principles.” As Budenz put it, “He [Green] was there explaining to the Communists that atheism was their standard, but sometimes in working with youth they had to be more lenient, and, of course, that meant that they would try to wean those youth away from religion entirely. That was Lenin’s instructions years ago.”

Here again, as the likes of Earl Browder and William Z. Foster would have averred, these religiously inclined communists (non-party leaders, importantly) could, temporarily, keep their juvenile religious superstitions, so long as they were in the process of ultimately liquidating those beliefs. Their church attendance would be tolerated for the time being, but not permanently.

They would be ultimately tolerated by atheistic communists about as much as atheistic communism tolerated all religion. As Lenin said, they must fight religious ideology.

Ben Gitlow's Testimony

Even more instructive than Louis Budenz's testimony was that of Ben Gitlow. Budenz had offered a mere morsel compared to the buffet of material Gitlow served up.

Gitlow, too, was a major Communist Party USA figure. In fact, he had risen higher than almost anyone next to Earl Browder and William Z. Foster. He twice ran as the party's candidate for vice president of the United States (1924 and 1928) and served on the Executive Committee of the Soviet Comintern. Budenz had never traveled to the Soviet Motherland, but Gitlow had done so on several occasions.

After a long silence upon leaving the party in 1929, Gitlow emerged to testify before Congress (first in 1939) and to write two major books, *I Confess* (1940) and *The Whole of Their Lives* (1948),⁴²⁵ where he laid out a litany of disturbing facts about CPUSA's relationship with Moscow, such as its members' "fanatical zeal" for the Motherland and "its ultimate victory over the capitalist world,"⁴²⁶ and revealing details of espionage and Soviet funding of the American Communist Party. As to the latter, Gitlow's figures itemized the Comintern's sending CPUSA \$100,000–150,000 annually (1922–29), its infusing \$35,000 to launch the *Daily Worker* (1924), and its providing tens of thousands of dollars to American union bosses, funding which continued still. For blowing the whistle, Gitlow earned the enmity of the Comintern and its American hacks. In an October 1939 memo to the Executive Committee of the Comintern, Pat Toohey, CPUSA's representative in Moscow, wrote a summary of Gitlow's Congressional testimony and denounced him to Soviet bosses as a "stool-pigeon and provocateur."⁴²⁷

Our interest here is Ben Gitlow's testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on July 7, 1953, seven years after Louis Budenz's testimony. Among the most shocking material was his information on how the American Communist Party and the Comintern penetrated the mainline denominations, particularly the Episcopal Church and the United Methodist Church. Gitlow made clear that the best agent for

the party (or worst depending upon your point of view) and the Comintern was the Rev. Harry Ward, especially via his commandeering the enormously damaging front-group the Methodist Federation for Social Action. The material from Gitlow on Ward and his organization is plainly stunning. He made clear that the Rev. Ward might have been one of the most duplicitous clergymen of the twentieth century. Reading this material will prompt readers to shake their heads at what scoundrels and inveterate deceivers men like Ward were. One wonders how the American mainline churches survived the treachery of men like this. In significant ways, they never fully did. Such church leaders wreaked havoc in the mainline denominations and generally throughout many Christian churches in America and the West, helping lunge them to the left, and prompting many Protestants to flee into more conservative denominations and into countless independent, non-denominational churches. The residual effects are still felt today, and the residual forces are still at work continuing the job.

Unlike Budenz, who spoke powerfully but briefly and mentioned the Catholic Church as being in communist crosshairs, Gitlow spoke powerfully but at much greater length and without a single mention of the Catholic Church. He was asked about “all” of the Christian faith, but his comments were mostly directed at Protestant churches generally, and the Methodist Church specifically. This was instructive—an accurate indicator of the reality. One will see throughout these excerpts from the official transcript of Gitlow’s testimony, published by the US Government Printing Office, that Gitlow’s use of the word “church” was properly printed with a lowercase *c*. That was because he was indeed speaking of the Christian/Protestant “church” generally (the exception came when he spoke of specific denominations, such as “the Methodist Church”).

Gitlow’s testimony in July 1953 took up almost seventy pages in the official on-the-record transcript, almost a third of which dealt with Ward and the Methodist Federation for Social Action. Every page of it deserves to be read. Here I will at best summarize some of the highlights, taken from about five thousand words of material transcribed for this book. The below quoted material is taken verbatim from the GPO published testimony.⁴²⁸

Exploiting and Destroying the Church

Gitlow began his testimony by sharing his communist-socialist bona fides, starting with his joining the Socialist Party in 1907 before helping to launch the Communist Party in America in 1919, for which he became one of the very top leaders throughout the next decade. He ran on the Communist Party ticket for everything from mayor of New York City to governor of New York, as well as (as noted) vice president of the United States. He had been so central to directing the party that by 1929 he had risen to the pinnacle as general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States—until his disagreements with Joseph Stalin got him expelled that same year. It would be difficult to find a more committed comrade. Gitlow was one of countless examples of comrades who got the ax for not offering 100 percent fealty to the Kremlin at every waking moment.

Gitlow was asked to testify specifically that day to “the matter of Communist infiltration of religious institutions.” He did not disappoint.

The questioning of Gitlow was begun by the House Committee’s chief counsel, Robert Kunzig. Here are excerpts from the official transcript:

Mr. Kunzig. Now, Mr. Gitlow, the main purpose for which you have been invited to testify before this committee at this time is to give from your extensive background your experiences in connection with the relationship of the Communist Party to religion.

Would you in brief, please, trace the position of the Communist Party on the question of religion and its policies, if any, in the matter of Communist infiltration of religious institutions? ...

Mr. Gitlow. I believe that the basic atheistic position of world communism to religion has not changed from the inception of the Communist movement to date. The questions of the strategy and tactics which the Communists use for the purpose of exploiting the church, clergy, and the followers of the church for its own purposes are not in contradiction with the basic atheistic position and final goal of the destruction of the church as a superstitious institution in the service of capitalism and imperialism.

Mr. Kunzig. Will you please elaborate on that, Mr. Gitlow?

Mr. Gitlow. I think a number of references should prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Communist movement is an atheistic movement.⁴²⁹

At this point in his testimony, Gitlow cited a pamphlet edited by the executive committee of the Komsomol, the youth organization of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which laid out what communists themselves called “The 10 Commandments of Communism.” Published in the Moscow newspaper *Bolshevist*, they were printed in the excellent 1950 book *The Vatican and the Kremlin*, by Camille Cianfarra, the Vatican correspondent for the *New York Times*, who reported extensively on

relations between the Vatican and the Kremlin.⁴³⁰ Here were the ten commandments, as printed verbatim in the congressional record:

1. Never forget that the clergy is the most powerful enemy of the Communist state.
2. Try to win your friends over to communism and remember that Stalin, who has given a new constitution to the Russian people, is the leader of the anti-God army, not only in the U.S.S.R. but throughout the world.
3. Convince your friends not to have any contact with priests.
4. Watch out for spies and report saboteurs to the police.
5. Make sure that atheist publications are distributed among the largest possible number of people.
6. A good young Communist must also be a militant atheist. He must know how to use his weapons and be experienced in the art of war.
7. Wherever you can you must fight religious elements and prevent whatever influence they might have on your comrades.
8. A true “godless” must also be a good police agent. It is the duty of all atheists to guard the security of the state.
9. Support the godless movement with your money, which is especially necessary for our propaganda abroad where funds, under present circumstances, can only be spent secretly.
10. If you are not a convinced atheist you cannot be a good Communist or a real Soviet citizen. Atheism is indissolubly bound to communism. These two ideals are the pillars of Soviet power.

Gitlow quoted these from Cianfarra, who quoted from a pamphlet published by the Komsomol. Kunzig, in turn, asked Gitlow if this remained the position of the Communist Party in the United States, from its founding in 1919 to that day. “It was identical,” said Gitlow, who then quoted further material, this time from a pamphlet titled “The Communist Program,” which was an analysis of the principles of the Russian Communist Party by none other than Nikolai Bukharin, one of the chief leaders of the Bolshevik Revolution, behind only Lenin and Trotsky. The Bukharin pamphlet was published in the United States in 1920 by the Contemporary Publishing

Association, one of the early underground publishing organizations of the Communist Party. It stated:

All these considerations explain the program of the Communists with regard to their attitude to religion and to the church. Religion must be fought, if not by violence, at all events, by argument. The church must be separated from the state....

There is a poison called opium. When it is smoked sweet visions appear. You feel as if you were in paradise, but its action tells on the health of the smoker. His health is gradually ruined, and little by little he becomes a meek idiot. The same applies to religion. There are people who wish to smoke opium, but it would be absurd if the state maintained at its expense—that is to say, at the expense of the people—opium dens and special men to serve them. For this reason the church must be—and already is—treated in the same way. Priests, bishops, archbishops, patriarchs, abbots and the rest of the lot must be refused state maintenance. Let the believers, if they wish it, feed the holy fathers at their own expense on the fat of the land, a thing which they, the priests, greatly appreciate.

To say this was a hard, distasteful, cynical view of religion would be an obvious understatement. Nonetheless, it was fully consistent with the long-accepted communist view of religion: Religion was a seductive drug, a poison, an opiate that when smoked produces sweet visions, hallucinations, turning the junkie into a “meek idiot.” The priests were like the dealers; they peddle the junk to hook the addicts who sit stupidly in the pews.

What was the Soviet Comintern’s position on religion? It was the same. Kunzig asked Gitlow that very question. In reply, Gitlow quoted from official Comintern literature: “One of the most important tasks of the cultural revolution affecting the wide masses is the task of systematically and unswervingly combating religion—the opium of the people.”

“The Infiltration of Religious Organizations”

Robert Kunzig then asked Ben Gitlow about the Communist Party in the United States having “adopted a policy for the infiltration of religious organizations.” Had that taken place? Gitlow’s answer was quite illuminating. The exchange should be absorbed in full for its richness of disturbing detail, right down to individuals named:

Mr. Gitlow. The policy in those days was framed in such a way that the members of the Communist Party could infiltrate church organizations for the purpose of conducting their propaganda among them, for enlisting their support for Soviet Russia and for the various campaigns in which the Communists were interested.

Mr. Kunzig. Mr. Gitlow, the House Committee on Un-American Activities is interested, of course, in the valuable background of material which you are giving, but they are also

interested in specific examples. Can you cite any specific examples of these tactics to which you are referring?

Mr. Gitlow. Certainly. The Russian Communists were the first to exploit ministers of the United States and through them, the church organizations, for the purpose of spreading propaganda in favor of Communist Russia and for the building up of a pro-Soviet sentiment among church people in America and among Americans generally.

I will, if I may, make mention of a few of the prominent American religious leaders who were used for that purpose in the early 1920's: Dr. Kirby Page, Dr. Sherwood Eddy, Jerome Davis, Dr. Harry F. Ward, the Rev. Albert Rhys Williams, and others. In reference to Albert Rhys Williams, it is interesting to note his biography. Albert Rhys Williams was a graduate of the Hartford Theological Seminary. He was a minister and director of the Maverick Church and Forum of Boston, Mass. When he went to Russia he became a Communist and got a job as assistant in the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs in the Soviet Government. He became a secret member of the Communist Party of the United States. He worked for the Communists in preparing propaganda to foment a Communist Revolution in Germany [sic]. He organized the International Legion in the Red Army.

In 1943 and 1944 Albert Rhys Williams, a paid agent of the Soviet Government, a secret member of the Communist Party, nevertheless, had such prominence in the United States that he became a lecturer at Cornell University for the years 1934 to 1944. He was also a contributing editor to the Survey Graphic, the leading magazine in the field of philanthropy and social service in the United States....

Mr. Kunzig. Did the Communist Party of the United States in the early 1920's enlist the support of church people for its campaigns and in support of the Communist Party, its activities in Soviet Russia?

Mr. Gitlow. It certainly did, for the number of ministers that actively supported the Communist Party in those days, though not as large as it is today, was, nevertheless, impressive. The outstanding clergymen among them were Dr. Harry F. Ward, Bishop William Montgomery Brown, Jerome Davis, William B. Spofford, and Albert Rhys Williams. The one that I know was a Communist Party member was Bishop William Montgomery Brown. The others cooperated closely with the Communist Party, and in the political committee of the Communist Party their activities on behalf of the Communist Party were continuously discussed.

We see here an unequivocal affirmation from Gitlow that members of the Communist Party had a policy to infiltrate church organizations in order to carry out propaganda among them "for enlisting their support for Soviet Russia and for the various campaigns in which the Communists were interested." And this was done not merely by American members of the Communist Party but by "Russian Communists," who, said Gitlow, "were the first to exploit ministers of the United States and through them, the church organizations, for the purpose of spreading propaganda in favor of Communist Russia and for the building up of a pro-Soviet sentiment among church people in America and among Americans generally." That is a remarkable statement.

Gitlow then named names of those exploited, underscoring, however, that not all were exploited. For example, Episcopal Church Bishop William Montgomery Brown was a Communist Party member. This is no surprise. Bishop Brown, known as “the bad bishop,” was so heterodox in his Christianity (and blatantly pro-Marxist) that he was eventually tried for heresy and deposed for his teachings. He was expelled from the Episcopal Church. Still, he had attempted to foster his heresy and pro-communism from within.

Gitlow also knew Albert Rhys Williams to have been a “paid agent of the Soviet Government,” as well as a secret member of the Communist Party. Williams had become a prominent lecturer in the Ivy League, at Cornell University. A Congregationalist who had attended Hartford Theological Seminary, Williams was gushingly pro-Bolshevik, to the point that every person in that congressional hearing would have nodded in assent when Gitlow named him among the Soviet sympathizers.

Truth be told, not a person named by Gitlow would have made anyone in that room flinch: neither pro-Soviet lieutenants such as Episcopal Church Bishop William B. Spofford and Jerome Davis nor others like Dr. Sherwood Eddy, a New England blueblood who was a product of Phillips Andover Academy, Yale, and Princeton Theological Seminary.

Kunzig’s questions along these lines for Gitlow continued. He next asked him how the communist penetration came about. This led to a key explication by Gitlow of the communist tactic of the “united front.”

Mr. Kunzig. Can you tell us how the Communists infiltrated the religious field?

Mr. Gitlow. Before I answer that question I believe it will help the committee to get a better understanding of the Communist technique if I deal briefly with the tactic of the united front adopted by the Communists in 1922 after they realized that their militant policy for instigating a revolution in Germany and then throughout Europe and the world had failed. The united-front policy by Lenin and approved by the Comintern became the official policy of the Communist Party of all countries, including the Communist Party of the United States. Its implementation in the United States resulted in the formation by the Communist Party of many united-front organizations and the initiation of a number of united-front actions.

The united-front tactic enabled the Communists to greatly increase the effectiveness of their infiltration activities. The united-front tactic was first directed toward the development of pro-Soviet sentiment and support of the Soviets; second, to build up support for the Communists in the trade unions and to create the organizations and conditions for their capture by the Communists; and third, to spread Communist propaganda, incite discontent among the people, undermine the loyalty of the American people and to divide them on religion, national, racial, and economic lines.

Kunzig immediately zeroed in on the religious element. He asked Gitlow explicitly what the policy of the united front had to do with the infiltration of religion. That conversation piqued the interest of everyone, including the longtime chairman of the committee, Pennsylvania Democrat Francis E. Walter, who jumped in:

Mr. Gitlow. The united-front policy enabled the Communists to widely expand their infiltration activities on the religious field because instead of using the Communist Party directly in enlisting the support of the clergymen and laymen who were pro-Soviet and supported the Communist Party and its activities, the Communist Party could enlist them through the front organizations, and on the specific issues of the united front. It was, for the Communists, for men and women operating in a field hostile to communism, to operate in the name of a front organization instead of in the name of the Communist Party. The front organization served as a shield to protect those individuals who were Communists or who explicitly carried out the Communist Party instructions from the charge that they were Communist agents. Besides, on specific issues the Communist Party, through the front organizations, was able to enlist a large number of individuals to follow its line, who under other circumstances would not do so....

Mr. [Congressman Francis E.] Walter. And by “united-front organizations” technically is meant organizations which are part and parcel of the Communist movement?

Mr. Gitlow. No. United-front organizations are organizations which are organized by the Communist Party through which they can enlist on specific issues the support of other organizations which are not Communist organizations and in which they can enlist the support of individuals who will go along with the Communist Party on a specific issue, but will not join the Communist Party on the issue of communism.⁴³¹

Here Gitlow offered important eyewitness affirmation of what we have seen in this book: the united-front tactic was pursued by communists in Moscow and in the United States, begun by the Comintern and initiated as official policy by the Communist Party of every country. The tactic enabled these members of the Communist Party to “greatly increase the effectiveness of their infiltration activities,” particularly in the churches. Those who were targeted and tapped in this strategy were not communists but liberal dupes exploited by communists.

Kunzig asked Gitlow about his specific role and what he witnessed among leaders of the Comintern in Moscow. What Gitlow described, particularly about the role of the Rev. Harry Ward in fostering communism in pre-Mao China, is very disturbing.

Mr. Kunzig. You were a member of various important committees of the Comintern and the Profintern.⁴³² Did you, when you were in Moscow, ever discuss the question of Communist infiltration of religion with the leaders of the Comintern?

Mr. Gitlow. The matter came up in Moscow, not only in reference to the infiltration of religion in the United States, but also in the Far and Near East.

Mr. Kunzig. Will you give us some specific instances?

Mr. Gitlow. My first visit to Moscow was in 1927 when I attended as a delegate of the American Communist Party the enlarged sessions of the executive committee of the Comintern. During my stay in Moscow, I also attended the sessions of the Anglo-American Secretariat, the organization committee of the Comintern, headed by Piatnitsky, had private sessions with the man in charge of archives of the Comintern who also headed the Comintern's agitprop department,⁴³³ sessions of which I also attended, and in addition had a long conference with Stalin. At the meetings of the Anglo-American Secretariat, also at meetings of the executive committee of the Communist International and of its organization department, the question of the American Communist Party's activities on the religious field was discussed. At these meetings the Communist Party was directed to intensify its efforts to draw the religious elements into the party's united-front activities....

At the sessions of the organization department, the importance of establishing good contacts with the religious organizations so that the Communists could infiltrate the missions in China and use them for Communist purposes, was given serious consideration and special attention was drawn to the effective work which Dr. Harry F. Ward did for communism in China.

This raised the antennae of the House committee members and its counsel. Robert Kunzig paused to ask Gitlow if he was claiming that Dr. Ward had engaged in direct communist propaganda when he was in China in 1925. Gitlow responded emphatically in the affirmative: "Certainly. ... All the lectures delivered in China by Dr. Ward had for its main purpose bolstering up the position of the Communist movement in China and winning support of the Chinese intellectuals and Christians in China for the Chinese Communist movement and for Soviet Russia." Gitlow said that Ward's lectures in China in 1925 were highly appreciated and "discussed at length in Moscow at the Comintern." He said that Comintern officials judged that "clergymen with Dr. Ward's point of view, using the cloak of religion, could render service of inestimable value to the Communist cause in China and to Soviet interests."

Beyond lectures, Gitlow flagged the Rev. Ward's work for the group the Society for Technical Aid to Russia, which had been organized upon instructions of the Soviet government. It was used to facilitate travel into the Soviet Union by issuing visas and passports on behalf of the Bolshevik government. That organization, said Gitlow, "greatly aided the movement of Soviet spies into and out of the United States. It served as an important industrial espionage agency for the Soviet government in both the United States and in Canada."

In short, summed up Gitlow, Ward's Methodist Federation for Social Action was directly "tied into the China conspiracy."

That treasonous connection was not merely underhanded but nefarious and tragic. At that point in time, communism had a snowball's chance in Hades of gaining momentum in China. The likes of Rev. Harry Ward, however, did their damndest. They would do whatever they could to bring Mao Zedong to power. By 1949, they got their wish, and China soon became the single greatest killing field in the history of humanity, entirely at the hands of Mao's Marxists. No other despot in the long, sordid history of communism racked up a death total like Mao's.

And particularly infuriating for the world's Methodists is that among the first groups booted from Mao's China were the Methodist missionaries. No other group of Western missionaries had made greater inroads, but Mao and his Marxists—the buddies of Rev. Ward and his radical Methodist Federation for Social Action—sent them packing. They showed them the road out of China. To this day, of course, China remains communist and suffers under religious repression.

Communist Infiltration of Religion as “Major Policy” of CPUSA and Moscow

Ben Gitlow would give more testimony regarding Ward's doings in China, but our focus in this chapter is communist infiltration among American Christians. Kunzig questioned Gitlow on that topic directly.

Mr. Kunzig. When did the Communist infiltration of religion become a major policy of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. Gitlow. It certainly did. On August 20, 1935, with a full delegation of the Communist Party of the United States present, a resolution was adopted unanimously dealing with the preparation of the imperialists for a new world war.

Here was remarkable specificity, with Gitlow tagging a year, month, and date to an actual resolution—as well as a place: Moscow. What did it say? He quoted from the resolution, which included the “religious” among the groups targeted in the united front. According to Gitlow, this resolution declared, “The establishment of a united front with social-democratic and reformist organizations (party, trade unions, cooperative, sport, and cultural and educational organizations), and with the bulk of their members, as well as with mass national liberation, religious, democratic, and pacifist

organizations and their adherents, is decisive in the struggle against war and its Fascist instigators in all countries.”

Gitlow explained that this resolution was “very specific for it states that a united front on the part of the Communists and the organizations they control, with religious organizations and their adherents, is decisive in the struggle against war and fascism.” He said that the resolution was passed by the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International and “proves that Communist infiltration of the religious field was decided upon in Moscow as a major policy. Those who declare that such infiltration of religion, especially the Christian churches, is a figment of the imagination, either do so to hide the astounding facts about such infiltration or because they are too stupid to see or realize what is going on.”

Kunzig then asked Gitlow if communists in America had played a part in formulating the policy of the Comintern for the “infiltration of the religious field.” “The American Communists played quite an important part,” answered Gitlow, who had come to this hearing very well prepared for precisely such questions. He brandished a report made directly to Comintern officials in Moscow by Gil Green, head of the Young Communist League of the United States, which stated:

We are influencing larger masses of youth and are accepted by large numbers of them as a constructive force. In these organizations we found innumerable functionaries and cadres to fight with us against reaction. In the course of less than a year our Young Communist League built 175 units within these mass organizations and through these began to anchor the united front from below.

At the second American Youth Congress, the Young Communist League delegation was faced with many complicated questions, any one of which if handled in a broad way could have resulted in a break in the united front. For example, the question of religion. Many of the religious groups were skeptical about uniting with Communists, although they were against fascism, because they feared that was a trap to force our atheistic views upon them. This problem was solved by simply agreeing to permit all religious youth in the Congress to hold church services Sunday morning. This did not compromise the Communist youth and yet showed to the masses of religious youth that this was not a united front against religion but against political reaction.

It is instructive that communists were willing to momentarily set aside their contempt for religion to make this concession in the overall service of forging a united front. It was worth the price, for now.

Kunzig then asked Gitlow, “Did the Communist infiltration of religion, on an intensified scale, begin in the United States before the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in 1935?” That was a keen

question by Kunzig, no doubt cognizant of prior activities, having done his preliminary research. Gitlow answered, “It actually was in full swing in the United States in 1934. The Seventh World Conference of the Comintern only reiterated and greatly stressed, as I have already indicated, what had always been the policy of the world Communist movement.”

Kunzig proceeded to ask Gitlow about the primary organizations involved in carrying out a literal “Communist conspiracy” regarding religion. Here again, Gitlow named names, starting with the elephant in the Marxist living room: the Rev. Harry Ward’s unique gang of radical Methodists.

Mr. Kunzig: What were the main organizations through which the Communist conspiracy in religion was carried out?

Mr. Gitlow. The Methodist Federation for Social Action and organizations patterned after it in the other religious denominations and the united-front organizations set up by the Communist Party. The united-front organizations which recruited thousands of ministers, through which the Communist infiltration of religion was carried on on a grand scale and was highly successful, were the American League Against War and Fascism, later changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy, and the American Youth Congress.

Quite significantly, Gitlow here affirmed what many had suspected regarding just how far left and pro-Moscow were Ward’s Methodist Federation for Social Action and the united-front organizations “set up by the Communist Party.” These organizations recruited *thousands of ministers*, most of them presumably dupes, through which American Marxists in the Communist Party carried out their infiltration of religion “on a grand scale.”

Kunzig then asked Gitlow about what kind of an organization was the Methodist Federation for Social Action. Gitlow’s answer was chilling, and to this day should make faithful Methodists concerned about far-left radicals seeking to sabotage their church from within shudder. Gitlow stated, “The Methodist Federation for Social Action, originally called the Methodist Federation for Social Service, was first organized by a group of Socialist, Marxist clergymen of the Methodist Church, headed by Dr. Harry F. Ward. Dr. Ward was the organizer, for almost a lifetime its secretary and actual leader. He at all times set its ideological and political pattern. Its objective was to transform the Methodist Church and Christianity into an instrument for the achievement of socialism.”

Gitlow’s words jarred every member of Congress in that hearing room. He confirmed the worst fears and suspicions: the Rev. Harry Ward and his

cell of Marxist-socialist clergymen had sought nothing less than to convert the Methodist Church and Christianity as a whole into an instrument for socialist victory.

Gitlow further explained that the group had been established in 1907, twelve years before the organization of the Communist Party of the United States in Chicago in 1919. “The outbreak of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in November 1917,” Gitlow explained, “had a tremendous effect upon the Socialist ministers of this organization and especially upon Dr. Ward. When the Communist Party was organized in 1919, Dr. Ward was already a convinced Communist with a few insignificant minor reservations. By 1920 he was already, though not yet a member of the Communist Party, cooperating and collaborating with the Communist Party.” Note the words “not yet.” And this collaboration of Dr. Ward with the Communist Party, Gitlow emphasized, was fully reflected in the “expressions and activities” of the Methodist Federation for Social Action.

Gitlow detailed that Harry Ward, naturally, did not act alone. Among the “inner hard core” of the Methodist Federation was Jack R. McMichael, who Gitlow testified was a member and leader of the Young Communist League. McMichael was elected the organization’s executive secretary after Ward relinquished his leadership post, no doubt because the reverend’s plate was full. The churchman’s ideological cup had runneth over. So many front groups, so little time.

Regardless, Ward had been the brain and face and hand behind the Methodist Federation for Social Action, and still remained in the group and highly active. This was Harry Ward’s baby. This organization was, in essence, “a Communist cell headed by Ward, which functioned under the direction of the Communist Party. ... The Methodist Federation for Social Action was always in the grip of this Communist Party cell and was therefore an instrument through which the Communist Party operated on the religious field.”

Ben Gitlow wanted every member of that congressional committee to grasp just how unusual was the Methodist Federation for Social Action. He implored Congress to understand that the organization was comprised of communist Methodists—that is, of Methodists who were communists. Said Gitlow, “The Methodist Federation for Social Action is a membership organization made up entirely of Methodists. It does not affiliate other organizations with it. The Communist Party is not included as an affiliate.

The organization is a Communist Party instrument controlled by the Communist Party through the Communist cell secretly operating as a Communist Party disciplined unit in the federation.”

This was staggering testimony. Ward’s Methodist Federation for Social Action was not a typical left-wing organization of “social justice” clergy lamentably albeit innocently hoodwinked by conniving communists. To the contrary, testified Gitlow under oath, the Methodist Federation for Social Action was, flat out, by creation, a communist organization itself. The goal of the Methodist Federation for Social Action was to dupe others, to mislead others, to hoodwink others. It was not made up of suckers but of communist and pro-communist ministers looking to reel in suckers—that is, dupers, as opposed to dupes. It was a direct instrument of the Communist Party, controlled and directed by the Communist Party. And as for the Rev. Ward—who, it bears repeating here, was co-leader and one of the founders of the American Civil Liberties Union—he was a “convinced Communist” “cooperating and collaborating with the Communist Party.”

Hundreds of Pages of Stooges

How far did these tentacles reach into the wider United Methodist Church flock? Kunzig asked just that, and Gitlow’s answer was again shocking:

Mr. Kunzig. Did the Communists infiltrate the Methodist Church?

Mr. Gitlow. In the infiltration of the Methodist Church, the Communists were highly successful. To detail the extent of the Communist infiltration of the Methodist Church, the people who served the Communists in the Church consciously and those who were its stooges, would take several hundred pages of testimony.

Kunzig asked Gitlow if he could name the principal individuals involved in the infiltration of the Methodist Church. Gitlow replied very specifically: “The principle individuals involved in the Communist conspiracy to subvert the Methodist Church for Communist purposes are: Dr. Harry F. Ward, Rev. Jack R. McMichael, Rev. Charles C. Webber, Rev. Alson J. Smith, Dr. Willard Uphaus, Margaret Forsyth, Rev. Lee H. Ball, and Prof. Walter Rautenstrauch.” Each of these names could receive detailed examination here, but such would go beyond the scope of what is necessary in this book. All had the typical credentials. For instance, Rev. Charles C. Webber, the first manipulator named after Ward and McMichael, was likewise a joint

product of Union Theological Seminary (where he was on the faculty) and of Columbia University (where he received a master's degree).

Equally alarming, however, was the extent of their influence among the wider Methodist flock. Moreover, their organization operated without official sanction from the United Methodist Church, no doubt infuriating the UMC leadership, or at least those among the leadership who were not left-wingers. Gitlow explained:

The Methodist Federation for Social Action operated, though it was an unofficial organization, as if it had the official sanction of the Methodist Church. Its limited, small membership, fluctuating between 2,000 and 10,000, is dominated by a handful of Communists who never officially avowed their Communist affiliations. The Communists in the organization maintained an alliance with militant, revolutionary Socialists, who were not under Communist discipline, but who nevertheless went along with the Communists. The Communists operated within the Methodist Federation for Social Action on the premise that it was important to keep within the Methodist Federation for Social Action all the Socialist, leftist, pacifist, and the so-called liberal and progressive elements just so long as they went together with the Communists on specific issues.

It seems odd that Gitlow would describe this as a "limited, small membership," given that a membership of several thousand, or two thousand to ten thousand, is quite substantial. Then again, Gitlow was surely familiar with even larger webs spun by Communist Party USA and the Comintern.

Kunzig asked Gitlow to spell out the connections between the Methodist Federation for Social Action and the leading communist-front organizations that he had mentioned with important roles in the Communist Party infiltration of religion. Gitlow thus responded with still more upsetting details, again revealing his intimate knowledge of the players involved, noting that the Methodist Federation for Social Action was affiliated with and "collaborated most closely with" the American League Against War and Fascism, the American League for Peace and Democracy, and the American Youth Congress. He duly added that it had been "no accident" that Dr. Ward, chairman of the Methodist Federation, became chairman of both the American League Against War and Fascism and the American League for Peace and Democracy, and served in that capacity for many years. Likewise no accident, the Rev. Jack R. McMichael became chairman for many years of the American Youth Congress.

When asked pointedly by counselor Kunzig if Dr. Ward used his position as chairman of the American League Against War and Fascism "to

aid the Communist conspiracy for the infiltration of the churches,” Gitlow responded without hesitation, “He did.” Gitlow then quoted from an article Dr. Ward wrote in the August 1934 issue of *Fight*, which was the official publication of the American League Against War and Fascism. Titled “Churches and Fascism,” Ward wrote:

They live narrow starved lives with no knowledge of economics or politics, no interest in science, no contacts with literature or art. Their religion supplies them with an opiate that takes them into the dream world. They are the natural followers of a powerful demagogue who can deceive them with vague promises and revolutionary phrases. When their economic security is gone or threatened, their undisciplined emotions can quickly be turned into hate of the Jew, the Communist, the Negro. The only preventative serum that will make them immune from these poisonous germs is propaganda in emotional terms that enables them to locate the real enemy. The people who come to know that the capitalist system is the source of their economic troubles are not easily led to chase and beat scapegoats. *To work at that task the American League Against War and Fascism needs to get members in all religious organizations. [emphasis original]*

That is an astonishing statement from a minister. In fact, given such sentiments, including describing religion as an opiate that floats the folks in the pews into a dream world, one is tempted to wonder if the Rev. Harry Ward was really even a *Christian* minister. Was he an atheist-communist plant—a wolf in sheep’s clothing? Writings like this beg the question.

The committee’s inquiry went on, with Kunzig asking about other officials in the Methodist Federation of Social Action who were perhaps also officials of the American League Against War and Fascism. Again, the encyclopedic Gitlow named still more names, all of which are probably beyond the scope of this book, with the overall point of the Marxist infiltration having been made clear.

But alas, one final exchange between Kunzig and Gitlow is worth accentuating, for reasons which will be apparent:

Mr. Kunzig. You stated that the Communist infiltration of religion was decided upon at the World Congress of the Comintern on August 20, 1935, as a major Communist united-front tactic. Did Moscow follow up this resolution with an appeal to the clergymen of the world?

Mr. Gitlow. It did.

Mr. Kunzig. In what form was the Soviet appeal to the clergymen of the world made?

Mr. Gitlow. The drive, on a world scale for the Communist infiltration of religion, was started by Romain Rolland’s famous letter to the clergymen of the world, first issued in September 1935, printed in the Communist and pro-Soviet press of the world. It first appeared in the United States in the November 1935 issue of *Soviet Russia Today*.

Romain Rolland was a strange French writer who won the Nobel Prize in literature. He was part spiritualist, part Freudian, part mystic, part socialist. Gitlow quoted a significant passage from that November 1935 issue of *Soviet Russia Today*, which was a key pro-Soviet, communist-front publication: “The results are gigantic. You and your friends can go and see for yourselves. For the U.S.S.R. today is accessible to all and its doors are wide open. You will see a social faith which is equal to, and in my mind, surpasses all the religious faiths, for it is at the service of the entire human future.”

This appeal from Rolland to the clergy of the world, of all religious denominations, which, said Gitlow, the Frenchman was forced to write at the behest of the Communist International and the Soviet Government, “contains unvarnished the statement that communism as practiced in the Soviet Union surpasses all religious faiths, therefore, leaving the conclusion that it should become the accepted religion of mankind.” Again, one is reminded of Ronald Reagan’s description of Marxism-Leninism: “that religion of theirs.”

Counselor Kunzig asked Gitlow the million-dollar question: “Why are the Communists so interested in enlisting the support of clergy and in infiltrating religious organizations of all kinds?” Gitlow answered that “religion through the clergy and its various institutions interlocks with and influences practically every field of human endeavor.” He rattled off “important contact points,” such as military chaplains (and thus the armed services), education, children, church missions, social agencies, foundations, philanthropy, publishing (“the religious organizations maintain large and extensive publishing houses and publish numerous magazines, pamphlets, and leaflets dealing with almost every subject interesting mankind”), and more. In all, religion was “an integral part of the cultural life of the country,” from education to business to politics. Gitlow summed up, “The Communists would consider themselves fools and idiots to neglect such an important field as the religious field, for religion exerts its direct influence on life, it can truthfully be said, from the cradle to the grave.”

They would indeed. And they sadly found many fools and idiots to enlist in their grandiose cause of infiltrating churches—for the purpose not of promoting the Christian religious faith but, rather, of obliterating it.

CHAPTER 10

“THE DEVIL DOTH QUOTE THE SCRIPTURE”

MANNING JOHNSON ON THE INFILTRATION OF THE CHURCH

Shortly after Ben Gitlow testified before Congress came Manning Johnson, who, like Gitlow and Louis Budenz, was a prominent ex-communist. He was particularly well-known as a leading African-American communist. Johnson, too, witnessed “Uncle Joe” Stalin (as FDR affectionately called Stalin) and his USSR ordering around Communist Party USA. He left the party in disgust.

Johnson had served on the National Negro Commission, an important subcommittee of the National Committee of the Communist Party. It was important because of the vigorous push by CPUSA and the Comintern to attempt to organize black Americans into a segregated “Negro Republic” in the South.⁴³⁴ That National Negro Commission, said Johnson, was created “on direct orders from Moscow to facilitate the subversion of the Negroes.” He soon realized the full extent to which “the Negro is used as a political dupe by the Kremlin hierarchy.”⁴³⁵

Several top white communists, such as James S. Allen (an alias used by Sol Auerbach), Robert Minor, and Elizabeth Lawson were placed on the commission and ran the show. These white communists, said Johnson, “wielded more power than the nominal Negro heads of the Commission. In a word, they are like white overseers.” Moreover, “Every Negro member

was aware of the fact that these white overseers constituted the eyes, the ears and the voice of the Kremlin.”

The black man was expected to follow the dictates of Sol and the white masters. Good Negro communists were to be unquestioning Negro communists, who sat quietly and did as they were told. A good black communist listened to the white communist—his comradely master. For all their bluster about elevating blacks, this was how communists treated their African-American brothers.

Particularly egregious, Johnson alleged that white women were exploited by Communist Party leaders as sexual objects to be employed against black men in the party. “I observed how white women communists are used as political prostitutes,” wrote Johnson, “cohabiting with high-level Negro communists in order to spy on them.” He asserted, “This information is invaluable to the red hierarchy in their relations with their Negro lickspittles. In top red circles, this is known as ‘bedroom politics.’” The information procured by the white female communists was then transmitted to the white male communists as handy blackmail material against the black male communists, in case they got out of line—maybe did some back-talking, got a little “uppity” with the white folks. The black reds were basically being used as Uncle Joe’s Uncle Toms.

According to Johnson, the conveyor belt of information then went from these “Negro lickspittles” to various “progressive groups,” which were, in fact, a wider coalition of communists, fellow travelers, sympathizers, and liberals that “constitute the vehicle on which the reds pin their present hope of victory.”

What Johnson concluded of communists’ usage of blacks also applied to their exploitation of women, whether in America or the Soviet Union or elsewhere: “when communists unite with and support them [women] today,” he warned, it must be kept in mind that “it may be necessary to denounce them tomorrow and the day after tomorrow hang them.”

Thus, in the end, blacks and women were indeed treated like everyone else under communism: everyone could be abused and sometimes even executed.

Much more could be said about that, but our focus here is how communists exploited and infiltrated religion. Manning Johnson had some particular valuable insights into how communists viewed not just blacks

and women but religious people. Congress was particularly interested. The nation was interested. The churches were interested.

Destruction Through Infiltration

Manning Johnson's testimony before Congress was given on July 8, 1953. His primary questioners were the committee's lead counsel, Robert Kunzig, and Congressmen Kit Clardy of Michigan and Gordon Scherer of Ohio. What he had to say is extraordinary. This chapter draws from a transcribed excerpt of roughly seven thousand words.⁴³⁶

Johnson spoke to the Christian faith in America generally: "The Communists discovered that the destruction of religion could proceed much faster through infiltration of the church by Communists operating within the church itself." Here, Johnson, like Gitlow, meant the Christian church or Christianity generally. In his uses of "the church," Johnson never once specified the Catholic Church. He spoke broadly of Christian churches, almost exclusively Protestant churches, even as some Catholic authors have tried to suggest otherwise.⁴³⁷ He did once mention in his testimony "the superstition of Rome," which was a reference to the Roman Catholic Church. By and large, however, Johnson spoke of Christianity as a whole. Most significant was his statement that communists determined and "discovered" that the destruction of religion could proceed much more rapidly by infiltrating the church and operating from within.

Manning Johnson began by stating that communists believed that every communist had a "duty" to extricate himself from the "supernatural bondage" of religion and to liberate the masses from that bondage:

Mr. Johnson: When I first joined the Communist Party, the district organizer, Peter Chaunt, C-h-a-u-n-t, and a member of the district bureau and the district committee of the Communist Party by the name of Otto Hall, talked at great length to me on the subject of communism and religion. The essence of what they said was that man made God, not God made man, and that the duty of every Communist is to rid himself of the supernatural bondage of religion; that religion is used by the powers that be in order to keep the masses of the people in docile submission to exploitation. Therefore, the liberation of the masses of humanity is dependent upon their emancipation from religious ideology.

Johnson himself experienced that. During the time he was an active member of the Communist Party, he was not atheist. He explained to the congressional committee, "I hid my religion. I committed the grievous sin of hiding it. I outwardly accepted the atheistic anti-religious program of the

Communists, but secretly in my heart I retained my religious convictions. Of course, that was an awful struggle, an internal struggle, a struggle between two different and opposing philosophies, the philosophy of charity and the philosophy of hate. Sometimes I wonder how I did that tightrope walking.” In fact, added Johnson, now that he had left the party, he had joined a Baptist Church in New Jersey and attended church services in New York regularly.

Johnson explained how the Communist Party indoctrinated its members via “so-called lessons of indoctrination, they gave me Lenin’s writings on religion.” Counsel Kunzig asked when and where this happened, and about the materials Johnson received:

Mr. Kunzig: When and where was this given to you, Mr. Johnson?

Mr. Johnson: This was in Buffalo, N. Y., when I first joined the party, in 1930.

Mr. Kunzig: Do you have any samples of any printed instruction which was given to you?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, I do have. I was given the pamphlets and booklets that were written by Bishop William Montgomery Brown. He was a prominent Episcopalian bishop who was expelled from the church because of heresy. He devoted the balance of his life to a war on religion. He published such books as the *Bankruptcy of Christian Supernaturalism*, *Heresy*,⁴³⁸ and others. The Communist Party received a large supply of these antireligious pamphlets, and they circulated them very extensively. They either gave them away or sold them.

Mr. Kunzig: Throughout the United States of America?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, throughout the United States.

Mr. Scherer: Let me just ask one question. You have here with you this morning some of the books and pamphlets of Bishop Brown to which you have referred; have you not?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, I have.

Mr. Scherer: Would you just for the record say which ones are in your possession at this time?

What Manning Johnson then proceeded to furnish was of compelling interest, and very enlightening as to the thinking of these leftist ministers—specifically, Bishop William Montgomery Brown, the Episcopal bishop (mentioned earlier in the Gitlow testimony) who was ultimately expelled from his denomination for heresy. He was the so-called “bad bishop.” Johnson had brought a copy of Bishop Brown’s multivolume *Bankruptcy of Christian Super-naturalism*, volumes 1, 2, and 3. He also toted along a copy of Brown’s *Communism and Christianity*, where he quoted from page 210: “Christianism is nothing to either the owners or workers in the sky, for its God and heaven, devil and hell are lies, and neither religious Christianity or political republicanism or democratism, not to speak of the other evils of

religion and politics, offers the workers aught on earth. Capitalism is the god of this world, of no part of it no more than of these United States, and capitalism is to the laborer a wrong, lying, murderous devil, not a good divinity.”

That is a shocking set of beliefs from an ordained minister. But Bishop Brown was a shocking man. By this point, Brown was deceased, and Johnson informed the committee that the late Episcopal bishop had willed his entire estate to the Communist Party. Not to his church but to the party.

Manning Johnson here added the one reference he made in his testimony to the Roman Catholic Church, which had been in Bishop Brown’s crosshairs, as it was for his fellow communists: “I may also state that the main theme of Bishop Brown was to banish gods from the heavens and capitalists from the earth for the science of Moscow against the superstition of Rome [i.e., the Roman Catholic Church].”

Johnson noted that Bishop Brown not only wrote such books for adults but he also wrote books for children in order to indoctrinate them in atheism. Said Johnson, “He also issued antireligious material for children. ... When I was a member of the Communist Party, the Communist Party paid special attention to the indoctrination of the youth. They in fact issued special bulletins instructing leaders and teachers with regard to the type of training for the youth.”

Johnson affirmed that during the period of his membership in the Communist Party there was never any deviation from the basic antireligious line. There was, however, a change in what he called “the tactical application of the Communist Party’s antireligious policy.” This tactical change was made in 1932 at a meeting he attended of the national committee of the Communist Party in New York, “at which time Earl Browder made a speech to the committee in which he said that our aim should be to draw the religious element into the movement before we convinced them to become atheists. In other words, to reverse the old policy of convincing the worker and farmer to become an atheist before he became active in the Communist Party movement. As Browder put it, that old policy was like putting the cart before the horse.”

Counsel Kunzig was on to this: “In other words, if you cannot completely destroy religion, would you say that the correct phraseology would be that it is best to attempt to infiltrate it first and then later destroy it?” Johnson answered, “I would say that the policy then was to first get the

worker and the farmer involved in Communist activities, and in the course of his involvement in these activities you steadily indoctrinate him in the antireligious philosophy of the Communist Party.”

Johnson noted that this stood contrary to previous procedure whereby the communist first approached the average worker and farmer with an antireligious program and policy. The result of this was that the Christian worker was antagonized, and a wall of resistance was built up “between the party and the religious element in America.” The new policy aimed to break down this wall of resistance by “getting the Christian element in, thereby getting the Communist Party out of the rut of sectarianism in which it had fallen.”

But at the same time, said Johnson, the Communist Party pursued both tracks. It continued its antireligious propaganda while simultaneously revising its tactical approach toward the Christian element in order to draw in sympathetic Christians: “Once they got them in, they continued to indoctrinate them in their antireligious program.”

Counsel Kunzig thus pivoted to the matter of the united front. He asked Johnson to describe that front. Johnson explained:

The united front was a development of a new tactical line by the Communist International in 1935. This new tactical line was developed at the seventh world congress of the Communist International in Moscow in 1935. Georgi Dimitrov, general secretary of the Communist International, presented this new tactical line to the seventh world congress. Now, the essence of it was to infiltrate churches, trade unions and all other organizations through the process of involving them into a so-called united front on the basis of a program presented to them by the Communist Party.

Now, the united front was a coalition or an alliance of the church, trade unions, farm and youth and women’s organizations of the Communist Party, under Communist Party leadership and for the promulgation of the Communist Party program. It was a step in the formation of a people’s front government, which of course is a form of transition to proletarian revolution and the seizure of power in a given country. As Dimitrov said, the united front is useful, but the final salvation is in a socialist revolution. The united front is used for revolutionary training of the masses.

Notably, Johnson thereby had backed Ben Gitlow’s testimony regarding where and when this new tactical line had started: in Moscow in 1935. And the ultimate goal was not Christian salvation, of course, but the “final salvation” of a socialist revolution.

Dagger to the Heart of the Church

Robert Kunzig pushed on to the crucial related question of Earl Browder's "outstretched hand." Johnson's description is striking. He explained that the outstretched hand was the "new united-front policy of the Communist International applied all over the world." Again, using lowercase *c* to refer to the wider Christian church all over the world, he said that this was "the extension of the hand of friendship and cooperation to the church, while in the other hand holding a dagger to drive through the heart of the church." In other words, it was a ruse whereby communists could get the churches involved in united-front activities so communists could bring to the "religious element in America" their antireligious program. The goal was to educate the masses in the revolutionary program and policy of the Communist Party, "to prepare them ideologically and organizationally for the overthrow of the Government of the United States."

The outstretched hand concealed a knife.

As evidence to back his provocative assertions, Johnson entered into his testimony some documents for the record. First among them was the *Communist*, the theoretical organ of Communist Party USA, specifically an article titled "The United Front: The Key to Our New Tactical Orientation," written by Earl Browder. Johnson referenced pages 1076–77. He characterized Browder's argument as communists conceding that their old tactical orientation was wrong and thus had to be changed because new conditions had arisen. Nothing had changed from the obeisance to the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, but tactics had to be adjusted in order to achieve practical success—at least for now. Johnson noted that Dimitrov himself had pointed out that the united-front tactic, which (in Johnson's characterization of Dimitrov) "is aimed at getting control of the churches, is not a digression from the basic position of the Communist Party; that is, the struggle for revolution, the conquest of power, but merely a reconstruction of tactics in accordance with changing situation. It is the tactic to draw wide masses into revolutionary class struggle where the working people, both Christians and Jews, will be welded into a millionfold strong revolutionary army, led by the Communist International under the leadership of Stalin at that time."

These tactics, said Johnson, were brought out by Dimitrov, who invoked Greek history, the Battle of Troy, the Trojan horse, as the best model for what they were trying to do. He quoted Dimitrov: "Comrades, you remember the ancient tale of the capture of Troy. Troy was inaccessible to

the armies attacking her, thanks to her impregnable walls, and the attacking army, after suffering great losses, was still unable to achieve victory until, with the aid of the Trojan horse, it managed to penetrate to the very heart of the enemy's camp." In other words, said Johnson, what Dimitrov was saying "is that if you cannot take over the churches by frontal attack, take them over by the use of deception and guile and trickery, and that is exactly what the Communists practice in order to infiltrate and subvert the church and prepare them for the day when they would come under the hierarchical and authoritarian control of Moscow."

Communists were employing Trojan horse tactics.

Manning Johnson then gave some specifics to explain how this played out. He noted that the leaders of the Communist Party "had an eye toward the millions of people in the churches, and this policy was designed specifically to reach the millions in the churches." Party officials had done their homework. Johnson said that as early as 1931 the Communist Party actually did a survey of churches in the United States "which was published by certain international pamphlets." In the pamphlet titled "The Church and the Workers," by Bennett Stevens, could be found a survey of the Christian churches, their membership, and holdings. Johnson read what Stevens said about the wider Christian church. He said that the survey "was not prepared without instructions from the Communist Party, because when pamphlets of this kind, according to my knowledge and experience, are written and published, they are published under instructions of the top leadership of the Communist Party, both in America and abroad, because such pamphlets are sent to the Soviet Union where they are evaluated, and on the strength of them the policy for the Communist Party of America is formulated, and not only for America, but throughout the world." He said that the survey showed how many people in America were connected with Christianity, a key reality "not lost to the men who sit in the Kremlin and are formulating policy for the American party." Johnson quoted:

The churches are effective propaganda agencies, for they reached a membership of 50 million persons in 1930. That capitalists are conscious of this fact is shown by the liberality of their donation to the churches. As one of his many contributions to the Episcopal Church, J. P. Morgan paid the expenses involved in publishing the revised Book of Common Prayer. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in addition to building a \$7-million church in New York, gives millions to Baptist colleges and other religious enterprises. In 1929 gifts to Protestant churches of the United States amounted to \$520 million. The churches are not spiritual institutions, but are in themselves powerful, wealthy, capitalist corporations, and as such have special church-property investments, and churches spent \$817 million in immediate expenses in 1926. Only

a very slight portion of this went to benevolencies. The following table indicates the value of church property and expenses in some of the larger sects of the United States.

Again, CPUSA officials had done their research.

As Johnson described it, they then went on to give an estimate of the value of church property in the United States—something of keen interest to materialistic, anti-spiritual communists already inclined to see the churches and their capitalist supporters as blood-suckers. Johnson explained that the author of this article, Bennett Stevens, went on to say that “religion cannot be reformed, whatever its doctrine and ritual, that it remains an agency by which the capitalist class enforces its control. The program of those who want to reform existing religion must therefore be rejected.”

That was the longtime teaching, of course, of Karl Marx.

The significance of this, said Johnson, is that the Communist Party had already, in 1931, “seen the need of getting into the churches where 50 million Americans are, and this survey and surveys made after this one was made, constituted a very important factor in determining the Communist policy in infiltrating the churches and religious organizations.”

The policy and the conclusion were one of infiltration.

Congressman Scherer then asked the impressively prepared Manning Johnson for further documentary evidence. To that end, Johnson offered a statement by William Z. Foster in the *Communist* (August 1939 edition, pages 702, 703), quoting from Foster’s article, “Secondary Aspects of Mass Organization.” Said Foster, “Religion is another extremely important secondary aspect of American mass organization. Inevitably a social current so well organized and so deeply ingrained in the mind of the masses as religion has exerted a far-reaching effect upon the people’s mass organization of all types throughout their entire history.” Comrade Foster conceded “a very serious mistake of the American left wing during many years,” which had been “its attempt arbitrarily to wave aside religious sentiments among the masses.” This had backfired. Foster acknowledged the intention of the outstretched hand to reverse that error: “In recent years, however, the Communist Party, with its policy of ‘the outstretched hand,’ has done much to overcome the harmful left-wing narrowness of former years and to develop a more healthy cooperation with the religious masses of the people in building the democratic front.”⁴³⁹

Precisely that course was being pursued by America's Marxist-Leninists.

The United Front: "School for Communism"

Manning Johnson's testimony at this point further rang alarm bells. He heralded the fact that the success of the united-front policy had enabled the Communist Party to "come in contact with thousands of ministers and millions of people who make up their congregations all over the country." He said that "the fact that they were successful in the so-called outstretched-hand policy" was clearly stated by Earl Browder in his book *What Is Communism?* Johnson quoted from [page 147](#) of the book: "It is significant that the Communist Party, more than any other labor group, has been able to achieve successful united fronts with church groups on the most important issues of the day. This is not due to any compromise with religion as such on our part. In fact by going among the religious masses we are, for the first time, able to bring our antireligious ideas to them."

Note: no compromise with the religious. The idea was not for communists to warm to religion but to bring atheistic communism to the religious.

This prompted Robert Kunzig to zero in: "In other words, you would say, would you not, Mr. Johnson, that on the basis of your personal experience and knowledge the united front is the medium through which people were educated to communism?" Johnson answered, "That is correct." In a really jarring statement, Johnson added, "The united front is a school for communism. It is the instrument to bring the Communist Party program and policy to millions of people throughout the length and breadth of the country."

Kunzig asked Johnson if it would be correct to say that there was actually party recruiting occurring through the united front. "Yes, there was," affirmed Johnson. "The whole purpose of the united front was to bring the Communist Party into contact with millions of people from whom they had before been isolated in order to indoctrinate them, to educate them and train them in Communist policy and orient them along the path of revolutionary struggle."

At this juncture in his questioning, Johnson introduced into the congressional record an excerpt from the report to the Tenth National

Convention of CPUSA, done on behalf of the central committee by General Secretary Browder. The date was May 1938. In reference to the matter of communists training those involved in united-front activities, Browder had stated, “We propose to make the education of our leading people, the Marxist-Leninist training, the central task of the whole party. It shall not be confined to the members of the central committee and State leaders, but extended to a broad new circle of leaders for the States and sections and for party leaders in the mass organizations, trade unions, youth, Negro, farm, cultural, women’s, religious, national groups, and other organizations.”

Johnson here interjected that “the main purpose of this educational process of religious leaders is for the overthrow of the Government of the United States. The party, according to my knowledge and experience, realized that without subverting the millions of persons in the church, revolution in the United States is unthinkable; it is impossible. For that reason, a corps of trained persons was necessary who would be in a position to work successfully toward this end among the churchgoers.”

As further evidence, Johnson cited *Fight* magazine, which was the official organ of the odious front-group, the American League Against War and Fascism. In the April 1934 issue ([page 34](#)), *Fight* had declared:

This means that those who would use what resources are available in the churches to fight the development of fascism must be prepared to show the people in the churches that there is no way out under the profit system and that the only way they can get the better life that is within their reach is to take ownership and control out of the hands of the few, put it into the hands of the many, and develop a planned economy for the purpose of realizing the classless society. Then the emotions and ideals that will otherwise be misled by the Fascists will be directed to the defeat of the real enemy of the people—the capitalist system—and will be given a constructive outlet in the building of a new order. To work at this task the American League Against War and Fascism needs to get members in all religious organizations.

Note carefully what this set forth: the imperative to get members inserted and implanted in all religious organizations. Yes, *all* religious organizations. They would be marshalled together as part of a committed fighting force to defeat the “real enemy” of the people: the American capitalist system.

Kunzig here paused to ask Johnson which individual was the chairman of the American League Against War and Fascism, knowing the answer Johnson would provide: the Reverend Harry F. Ward. The counselor was ready to focus the spotlight in that direction. The specter of the Rev. Ward was haunting the hearing room yet again.

Mr. Kunzig: When you were a member of the Communist Party did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Johnson: Yes; he was a member of the Communist Party while I was a member.

Mr. Kunzig: Did you meet with him as such?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, I did.

Mr. Kunzig: Would you characterize him as a prominent member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Johnson: I would say that he is the Red dean of the Communist Party in the religious field.

Here the discussion shifted just a bit, or at least away from Ward for the moment.

They discussed the matter of training leaders for work in the united front. "The training of leaders for work in the united front is of major importance to the success of the Communist Party's program," said Johnson. "For that reason we had considerable discussions in the central committee and in the sections and districts and State committees of the Communist Party on methods of work among religious elements." Johnson personally participated in these discussions on both national and lower levels in the Communist Party. He presented to the committee the substance of some of those discussions that were aimed at educating party members on "how to work among the religious element." He quoted William Z. Foster directly: "Communists must ever be keen to cultivate the democratic spirit of mutual tolerance among the religious sects in the people's mass organizations. A still greater lesson for us to learn, however, is how to work freely with religious strata for the accomplishment of democratic mass objectives, while at the same time carrying on our basic Marxist-Leninist educational work."

Continuing along that line, said Johnson, communist leaders instructed him and his fellow comrades "in the use of deceit in dealing with religious elements." That colorful exchange between Johnson and Kunzig is worth quoting verbatim.

Mr. Kunzig: Was deceit a major policy of Communist propaganda and activity?

Mr. Johnson: Yes, it was. They made fine gestures and hon-eyed words to the church people which could be well likened unto the song of the fabled sea nymphs luring millions to moral decay, spiritual death, and spiritual slavery. An illustration of this treachery, I might point out, is smiling, sneaky Earl Browder, for example, who was vice chairman of the American League Against War and Fascism, greeting and praising ministers and other church workers participating with him in the united front, antiwar activities, while secretly harboring in his heart only contempt for them and for the religion that they represented.

As evidence of how the likes of Browder trained others in the use of such deceit, Johnson again quoted from Browder's 1936 book *What Is Communism?* "It is true that we have learned to be much more careful about the quality of our mass work in this field. We take pains not to offend any religious belief. We don't want to close the minds of religious people to what we have to tell them about capitalism, because of some remark or action offensive to their religion. We can well say that the cessation of ineffective, rude, and vulgar attacks upon religion is a positive improvement in our work."

This returned the attention of everyone in that hearing room to what Manning Johnson called the "major organizational form of the united front in which the churches were involved"—the American League Against War and Fascism. According to Johnson, this was "the key Communist Party front. There was no other Communist Party front in all of the solar system of organizations of the Communist Party that involved so many ministers, churches, and religious organizations." In fact, warned Johnson, this organization was "the key to the infiltration of the church, and as a result of the successful infiltration and penetration they were able to involve these ministers in every other Communist front through the years, even down to the present time."

Through the vehicle of the American League Against War and Fascism, the Communist Party was able to involve ministers in every communist front up through that present day.

Maybe looking to extend a little Christian charity to some of those ministers regrettably taken in, Kunzig said to Johnson, "Undoubtedly the great, great number of ministers who were involved one way or another in this or other Communist-front groups were loyal citizens and fine, good, religious men who were completely duped; is that not true, Mr. Johnson?" Johnson made a critical distinction between the ringleaders and those they misled. Many of the latter were in fact dupes.

Mr. Johnson: There were quite a few of them who were duped, but the Communist clergymen and fellow travelers and those under Communist Party discipline were not duped. They were fully conscious and fully aware of what they were doing. They were the small minority that utilized their position to infiltrate and seek to subvert the majority of the clergy in the interests of the aims and objectives of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. Kunzig: It was an example of a small minority attempting to influence, control, and use the majority of good, decent clergymen?

Mr. Johnson: Yes; that is true, because I know from my own experience in working in labor organizations, for example, that we had an organization with 10,000 members, and there were only about 60 or 70 Communists, and we controlled the organization. So with small minority of ministers who work in an organized manner, they can always win over and subvert and dupe the majority who are disorganized and are individualistic.

With merely a small group of, say, sixty to seventy, communists could redirect an organization of ten thousand. Impressive but sad. All that was needed was a small albeit dedicated cell of organized ministers. The ringleaders spearheading the front-group that was the American League Against War and Fascism knew how to manipulate. That brought the conversation right back to Rev. Harry Ward and friends.

Kunzig wanted to direct Johnson's and the committee's attention to this "very vital and important organization so that the true picture of the true work of this organization may become clear on this record." He asked Johnson to explain to the committee how this group was organized, who headed it, and in general its purposes and functions. Johnson was a rare eyewitness. He related to Kunzig and the committee that he had actually sat in on the very meetings of the national committee of the Communist Party in New York City for the formation of the American League Against War and Fascism. The league had been a literal communist plot from the outset, with Communist Party USA, at that meeting, taking its orders from and working with the Soviet Comintern. "The substance of these discussions was that the Communist International had formed an organization known as the World Congress Against War," explained Johnson, who added that the head of that organization was Henri Barbusse, a leader of the Communist Party of France and a confidante of Joseph Stalin. "The American party was instructed by the Communist International to form the American League Against War and Fascism." That organization, said Johnson, was officially set up at what communists had organized as their first "United States Congress Against War," held in New York City in 1933, an event attended by Barbusse, who also was instrumental in its organization and direction.

According to Johnson, the purpose was crystal clear: "The policy of this particular front—that is, the American League Against War and Fascism—was to involve the religious organizations into Communist Party activities generally to exploit the tremendous antiwar and anti-Fascist sentiment that exists among the religious masses." And that was why, said Johnson, the Rev. Harry F. Ward was selected to head the American League Against War and Fascism: "The party conclusion was that because he was a minister, he

would be able to draw in churches, and secondly, that he would be able to draw in labor because of his imposing record as a clergyman of some standing and note. In other words, they considered him the ideal head for the organization.”

This, said Johnson, was proven to be a good decision because the American League Against War and Fascism was able, “through exploiting the antiwar and anti-Fascist sentiments among the clergymen and among church people generally, to involve millions of people in supporting” its program.

He noted that because the majority of the American people are peace-loving and democratic and opposed to war and fascism, such a campaign had tremendous appeal. Nonetheless, added Johnson at length:

When such a campaign like the one against war and fascism is used as a cover to attack our government, our social system, our leaders, when it is used as a cover to attack our law-enforcement agencies and to build up mass hate against them, when it is used as a cover for the transmission of intelligence information to Soviet Russia, when it is used as a cover for Soviet espionage, when it is used as a cover for infiltration and subversion of our churches, seminaries, youth organizations, when it is used as a cover to undermine national security, when it is used as a cover to sabotage industry and transportation, when it is used to prepare and to influence and win over millions in support of the foreign policy of an alien government, namely, Soviet Russia, against our own country, when it is used as a cover to defend Communists, the sworn enemies of our great heritage, when it is used as a cover for preparing millions of people ideologically and organizationally for the overthrow of the United States Government, then that is a different matter altogether.

That was quite a mouthful from Johnson—in one sentence. And note, for our interests in this book, the particularly poignant line within that long sentence—namely, that this particular campaign and organization was used as a cover for infiltration and subversion of American churches and seminaries. “That is the program as it was worked out in the central committee,” said Johnson, “and that was the program that was advocated by the American League Against War and Fascism when I was not only a member of it, but a member of the national committee.”

Infiltration of Protestant Denominations and Seminaries

To re-emphasize, this infiltration and subversion of American churches and seminaries was, by Johnson’s testimony, a Protestant effort among fellow Protestants. At least he made no mention of Catholic churches and seminaries. Johnson spoke of “the program of the Communist Party for the

infiltration of the various Protestant denominations on the basis of conditioning them mentally, organizationally for the overthrow of the Government of the United States.”

Johnson identified the radical-left publication the *Protestant* as the print flagship for this effort. “The Protestant Digest [*The Protestant*] was first published in 1938 while I was a member of the party,” said Johnson, “and in the party circles it was discussed as one of the Communist-front publications that had as its aim and purpose using first the infiltration of the Protestant denominations; secondly, to carry the materialist, antireligious policy of the Communist Party into the religious denominations under the guise of religion.” He said that the *Protestant* even went so far as to provide ministers with pro-communist material for sermons to deliver to congregations at regular Sunday services.

In sum, such was the breadth and depth of Manning Johnson’s remarkable testimony in July 1953. Robert Kunzig asked him to conclude with a summary of the overall manner in which communists had attempted to “infiltrate and poison the religious organizations of America wherever possible.” Johnson’s reply was chilling, and it shines the light on the dark designs of what the likes of Earl Browder and Communist Party USA had really been up to amidst their sweet words about extending an “outstretched hand” and working with Christian believers for peace and harmony:

Once the tactic of infiltrating religious organizations was set by the Kremlin, the actual mechanics of implementing the “new line” was a question of following the general experiences of the living church movement in Russia where the Communists discovered that the destruction of religion could proceed much faster through infiltration of the church by Communist agents operating within the church itself.

The Communist leadership in the United States realized that the infiltration tactic in this country would have to adapt itself to American conditions and the religious makeup peculiar to this country. In the earliest stages it was determined that with only small forces available it would be necessary to concentrate Communist agents in the seminaries and divinity schools. The practical conclusion, drawn by the Red leaders, was that these institutions would make it possible for a small Communist minority to influence the ideology of future clergymen in the paths most conducive to Communist purposes.

We see once again the power, understood by communists so terribly well (and by the radical left in America to this day), of a tightknit group of committed organizers and what they could accomplish by igniting a ripple effect. A small minority of agents planted in the seminaries and divinity schools could influence the ideology of future clergymen in a way most conducive to Marxist purposes.

Johnson paused to add a critical point on how these radical leftists sought to politicize and ideologize the pulpit, tugging these churches away from their spiritual mission to a material one: “In general, the idea was to divert the emphasis of clerical thinking from the spiritual to the material and political.” This meant a formation based on communist doctrine and the communist program “to weaken our present society and prepare it for final conquest by Communist forces.” They would divert clerical thinking from “matters of the soul” to political-ideological matters.

And surfacing again in his testimony was the red dean, the Rev. Ward, captain of the Marxist-Leninist ship trolling the water for suckers. Seminaries were aggressively targeted:

The Communists had some small forces in the seminaries and under the leadership of Harry F. Ward. These were quickly augmented by additional recruits and siphoned into the divinity institutions by manipulations of Communist cells in the seminaries. This infiltration into seminaries was expedited by the use of considerable forces the Communists had in educational institutions which were eligible for hire by divinity organizations. The plan was to make the seminaries the neck of a funnel through which thousands of potential clergymen would issue forth, carrying with them, in varying degrees, an ideology and slant which would aid in neutralizing the anti-Communist character of the church and also to use the clergy to spearhead important Communist projects.

Communists thus created cells and “small forces” in seminaries. These in turn were quickly augmented by new recruits promoted up and “siphoned into the divinity institutions” and “educational institutions.” This was an actual “plan” to reorient the seminaries as “the neck of a funnel” to generate potentially “thousands” of clergymen who would uphold, in varying degrees, “an ideology and slant” that at the least would neutralize anti-communist elements in the wider Christian church and, at best, would exploit the clergy to “spearhead” important efforts of value to the communist cause.

How successful was this effort?

“This policy was successful beyond even Communist expectations,” asserted Johnson. “The combination of Communist clergymen, clergymen with a pro-Communist ideology, plus thousands of clergymen who were sold the principle of considering Communist causes as progressive, within 20 years, furnished the Soviet apparatus with a machine which was used as a religious cover for the overall Communist operation ranging from immediate demands to actually furnishing aid in espionage and outright treason.”

Yes, outright espionage and treason. Now that's a serious matter.

Moreover, the cohesiveness of these particular communists—directed in the service of a carefully preconceived plan of operation—was always among their greatest assets. “The Communists have an advantage in religious organizations due to the fact that their forces within religious groups are well organized as a totalitarian group which, operating as a highly mobile force, works unceasingly toward a premeditated program,” said Johnson. “This gives this destructive element a great tactical advantage over all others in the religious organizations who deal with religion as individuals, operating ethics on the basis of an individual conscience before God.”

And what kind of numbers were we talking about? By Manning Johnson's estimate, the number of trained forces by American communists reached into the thousands:

In the early 1930s the Communists instructed thousands of their members to rejoin their ancestral religious groups and to operate in cells designed to take control of churches for Communist purposes. This method was not only propounded, but was executed with great success among large elements of American church life. Communists operating a double-pronged infiltration, both through elements of Communist-controlled clergy, and Communist-controlled laymen, managed to pervert and weaken entire stratas of religious life in the United States.

Communists in churches and other religious organizations were instructed to utilize the age-old tradition of the sanctity of the church as a cover for their own dastardly deeds. Through Reds in religion, we have a true living example of the old saying: “The Devil doth quote the Scripture.”

The devil does quote the Scripture. He had the audacity to quote it directly to Jesus Christ, but in his own deceptive way—twisting and manipulating it. When he tried to tempt Christ with the material of the world, the Son of God corrected Satan, noting that man does not live on bread alone. Man is also a spiritual being. You cannot solve the problem of man by bread alone. Communists promised their flock the deception that man's plight could be resolved by bread, by the strictly material and not the spiritual. “From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs,” said Marx, misquoting the Scripture just slyly enough, with yet another deception.

But twentieth-century communists were especially slick. They would enlist clergymen (some duped, others doing the duping) to quote the Scripture to the flock. “The Communists learned that the clergyman under their control served as a useful ‘respectable face’ for most of their front

activities,” averred Manning Johnson. “In this way the name of religion was used to spearhead the odious plots hatched by the agents of antireligious Soviet communism.”

And yet, even with such large numbers, extending into the thousands, communists knew that the *quality* of the manipulators was always more important than the quantity. “Communist strategists counted the effectiveness of their forces not so much on numbers alone, but on the importance of individuals loyal to communism in key spots where a small group can influence large numbers and create havoc by controlling a sensitive spot,” said Johnson. “Thus one professor of divinity, lecturing to future clergymen, who in turn will preach to thousands of churchgoers, is, in the long run, more dangerous than 20 Red preachers singing the praises of communism from the pulpit.”

The best multiplier effect was generated by having the best initial sources to start the multiplication process. One really skilled pro-Marxist professor of divinity, smart and cautious with the language he used, could be far more influential than a couple dozen big-mouthed preachers less polished in their leftist proselytization efforts.

The same was true, said Johnson, for a communist agent holding an important position in a church publication that reaches large multitudes of the churchgoing public. “One practical effect of Red influence in church publications is to tip off scores of pro-Soviet clergymen, who are only too glad to receive sermon material through the medium of a church publication,” said Johnson. “The large backlog which the Communists have in the writing and journalistic field make it easy for them to infiltrate religious publications and organize new publications representing the Communist slant in church circles.”

Johnson concluded with another scary demonstration of how shrewdly communists could operate with a small band of true believers worming their way through an institution from the inside. Behold his jarring numbers: “It is an axiom in Communist organization strategy that if an infiltrated body has 1 percent Communist Party members and 9 percent Communist Party sympathizers, with well-rehearsed plans of action, they can effectively control the remaining 90 percent. ... In the large sections of the religious field, due to the ideological poison which has been filtered in by Communists and pro-Communists through seminaries, the backlog of

sympathizers and mental prisoners of socialistic ideology is greater than the 10 percent necessary for effective control.”

In other words, a trusting flock could, in the deceitful hands of a few bad shepherds, be led to spiritual slaughter. Or, in the case of the communist world as it existed in the USSR and behind the Iron Curtain, and in places like China, and, later in the killing fields of Cambodia and in Korea and Vietnam, *physical* slaughter as well as spiritual. All in the name of the sweet promises of communism and its preachers.

The devil doth quote Scripture indeed.

CHAPTER 11

“OVER A THOUSAND COMMUNIST MEN”

INFILTRATION OF CATHOLIC SEMINARIES? BELLA DODD’S CLAIMS

Manning Johnson was back before the House Committee five days later, on July 13, 1953.

Attorney Robert Kunzig asked Johnson for further detailed testimony about the Methodist Federation for Social Action. Johnson reiterated that Rev. Harry Ward’s group had been “invaluable to the Communist Party” in its united-front organizations and campaigns. The group had been invaluable “because through it the party was able to get contact with thousands of ministers all over the country.”

Yes, *thousands*. By this, Johnson meant thousands of “affiliated” ministers who were broadly sympathetic to the aims of the communist front-group and the social-justice buttons it was shrewdly pushing—albeit pushing subtly and carefully so as to try to avoid appearing too blatantly pro-Soviet. Effective manipulation required fastidious skill and cunning.

This prompted Michigan Congressman Kit Clardy to ask Johnson, “You mean they could contact ministers who had not the slightest idea about the sinister purposes and background of what they were trying to do?” Johnson answered, “That is correct. They had the contact, a wealth of contact, established and built up over the years with ministers in every section of the

country who were easily and quickly involved in various united-front activities, consequently giving these Communist-front movements an aura of respectability the like of which they could not get except for the tremendous amount of faith people have in religion and the church.”

This exchange prompted the committee’s counsel to bring into the conversation a name that had not been raised to Johnson in his previous testimony the week before: a lady named Bella Dodd.

Dodd had testified before the committee a few weeks prior. Kunzig related to Johnson that Dodd had spoken of her personal knowledge and involvement with the Communist Party in New York in creating what Kunzig referred to as “sucker lists.” These were “sucker lists of distinguished citizens, scientists, and professional people throughout the country whom they used whenever they needed distinguished fronts to cover up their purposes. These people did not know what their names were being used for.” Kunzig applied these to the preachers that Johnson had spoken of at great length, asking Johnson, “Is the testimony that you are giving with regard to these ministers an identically similar situation?”⁴⁴⁰

Johnson answered, “Yes, only with this exception, that there were a number of ministers who actually knew what they were doing.” Some were suckers, but others were not. Not all were naïve and innocent. Some of the ministers baited the hooks to catch the suckers. They were fishers of men—communists casting out for men to reel in for the cause.

Congressman Clardy clarified that Bella Dodd had indicated that “the vast majority” were suckers—dupes. There were a few who knew they “were lending themselves to Communist purposes, but most of them did not.”

But alas, what of those who knew? Who were they? How many of them? In this chapter, which is focused on Bella Dodd’s handiwork, we will explore how many of these clergymen were Roman Catholic. Manning Johnson and Ben Gitlow had flagged Protestant clergy, but what about Catholic priests? Had communists placed a bull’s-eye on Catholic seminaries?

The Tantalizing Case of Bella Dodd

That controversial and fascinating question is one which has reemerged with renewed rigor in recent years as the Roman Catholic Church deals

with the awful scandals that are the byproduct of unholy, unfaithful men in the priesthood. In her accounts, Bella Dodd said, “Yes,” the communists had, in fact, orchestrated a major infiltration of American Catholic seminaries in the 1930s and 1940s.

I have been asked increasingly in recent years about this claim of a major infiltration, to the point where I had no choice but to investigate it myself. The source cited is always Bella Dodd, whose claims from over a half century ago remain raw. Who was she? Could she have been involved in something like this? And could something like this have been pulled off?

We should understand first and foremost that Bella Dodd, who was a dedicated communist activist tasked with organizing educators via teachers’ unions, would have been undoubtedly aware of how such things worked. Few professions were sized up by communists quite like the teachers’ unions. Dodd desired and flatly pursued the infiltration of the teaching profession with thousands of communists. That being the case, and with such tactics being her expertise, it would not be a surprise if her comrades sought her assistance to try to infiltrate the priesthood as well.

Dodd (1904–69) was born and raised a nice little Catholic girl in New York by her Italian-immigrant parents. Baptized with the beautiful name Maria Assunta Isabella, the innocent child would one day morph into a rabid Marxist. That fundamental transformation took shape in college. Bella initially attended Hunter College. All was fine until the day that Bella and her friend Ruth Goldstein enrolled for courses at Columbia University. This “work at Columbia” would ruin her, at least for a time, as it would so many innocents, such as Thomas Merton and Whittaker Chambers, both of whom became communists there.

There, said Bella in her eye-opening memoir *School of Darkness*, she “discovered the John Dewey Society and the Progressive Education Association” and, of course, the Columbia Teachers College. That college was home to legendary education “progressive” John Dewey, founding father of American public education. Professor Dewey, who was pro-communist, is honorary president for life of the National Education Association. Bella soon realized “what a powerful effect Teachers College would have on American education.” She was especially influenced by Dr. George Counts, who, like his pal Dr. Dewey, had made pilgrimage to Moscow to pay homage to the Motherland.⁴⁴¹

She also thereby discovered what a powerful effect the Communist Party could have, as Bella moved into the education front and joined the party (a natural next step after Columbia). She earned her law degree from NYU (rather than finishing her doctorate at Columbia, where she earned a master's) and became a self-described and highly engaged "card-carrying Communist." In March 1943, she consented to become "an open Party leader" in order to more fully untether and unleash her ideological activities. In no time, those activities inevitably became a major hindrance to her marriage and family life, which was verboten according to her comrades who insisted that she could not be a good communist and have children. "The bourgeois family as a social unit was to be made obsolete," she was instructed. She obeyed. The party pushed her into "industry."

Bella also turned her back on her faith, becoming "anti-clerical."⁴⁴²

Religion likewise, of course, was absolutely verboten.

After many years of incessant activism, Dodd eventually became very disillusioned. She could only take so much: the lies, the conniving, the evildoing, the harassment and intimidation by party enforcers. In fact, before she could leave the party, her comrades expelled her. She later shared a harrowing moment when one of the leading party honchos, the austere Alexander Trachtenberg, confronted her: "We want to ask you a few questions," said an accusatory Trachtenberg in his thick German accent. "We hear you attacked the Cominform." (The Cominform was the rebranded name for the Comintern after World War II.) It was the usual treatment of Communist Party members held in suspicion. "I've been ill, Comrade Trachtenberg," Bella said in her defense. "I guess I'm all right now."⁴⁴³

That was the only reasonable explanation. Only a *sick* person, after all, would doubt the Cominform.

Trachtenberg, for the record, was identified by Whittaker Chambers as the "head of GPU" in the United States—that is, the notorious Soviet military police, a successor to the Cheka.⁴⁴⁴ He was a charter member of the American Communist Party and its cultural commissar. He was also the head of International Publishers, which had a monopoly on the publication and distribution of communist and Soviet books and pamphlets. "Trachtenberg once said to me," recalled Dodd in her memoir, "that when communism came to America it would come under the label of 'progressive

democracy.’ ‘It will come,’ he added, ‘in labels acceptable to the American people.’”⁴⁴⁵ These were benign labels like progressive, liberal, and democracy. She repeated this in slightly more detail in a major speech at Fordham University in 1950, where she said that Trachtenberg had told her in New York in 1944: “When we get ready to take the United States, we will not take it under the label of communism; we will not take it under the label of socialism. These labels are unpleasant to the American people, and have been speared too much. We will take the United States under labels we have made very lovable; we will take it under liberalism, under progressivism, under democracy. But take it we will.”⁴⁴⁶

Bella was a dutiful comrade on the education front. That was where she thrived in her party work. She became a union leader and organizer. The teachers, said Dodd, “were used on many different fronts” by the Communist Party. This was fundamental, she said, “to establish a Soviet America,” the designation used by CPUSA leaders to describe their new Comintern-directed country upon their “victory in America.” (Again, William Z. Foster’s book was titled *Toward Soviet America*.)⁴⁴⁷

Bella would later greatly regret what she did. As a teacher who was a leader in the union, she was especially concerned about how communists manipulated children through the educational system. “There is no doubt in my mind that the Communists will use the schools and every other educational medium,” she told the US Senate. “They will use every educational medium ... from the nursery school to the universities.”

Like Lenin before them, and the cultural Marxists that followed, they saw education as indispensable to inculcating their far-left agenda. “Give me four years to teach the children,” asserted Lenin, “and the seed I have sown shall never be uprooted.”⁴⁴⁸

Generally, Bella was a hardcore party hack and agitator, overt and covert. More overtly, she was (impressively) an actual editor at *New Masses*, where she served under Whittaker Chambers while he was secretly spying for the Soviet GRU.⁴⁴⁹ Covertly, she was involved in so many deceitful and nefarious front operations that it is hard to find sympathy for her even after she repudiated them and repented. She was, for instance, an organizer for the insidious American Peace Mobilization, arguably the most duplicitous front-group ever to exist in America. Bella was an organizer in that scam. She was so visible that she was photoed and featured in the left-

wing magazine *PM* on August 1, 1940 in an article titled “These Women Don’t Want Their Menfolk Conscripted.” There, Bella was featured among one hundred other delegates of the Trade Union Women’s Committee for Peace. The caption of the photo says, “Dr. Bella V. Dodd, center, holds batch of petitions asking President Roosevelt to keep America out of war.” Posing as an apostle of peace, Bella was following orders from the Kremlin. Such is just one photographic proof, in real-time, of her vigorously assisting a front-group effort that enlisted a substantial number of Protestant ministers and their congregants. In the photo, she feigns a look of sweet innocence, even as she was fronting and lying for Stalin and Molotov.

Bella was a ringleader in that effort. On September 3, 1940, in Chicago, one of the crucial initial meetings in the founding of the American Peace Mobilization, Bella (listed officially in the program guide as representing the American Federation of Teachers) was elected a “permanent officer” of the mobilization. She would remain one of its principle organizers and stalwarts. She also, in keeping with the same brazen about-face of other party stooges to Stalin, instantly flipped and became pro-war the minute that Hitler betrayed Stalin. When the American Peace Mobilization was ordered by the Kremlin and CPUSA to become the American *People’s* Mobilization, Bella saluted the red flag of her masters. On a dime, Bella Dodd was ready to grab her gun and urge American women everywhere to conscript their menfolk.⁴⁵⁰

This was just one of innumerable communist schemes that Bella was part of. She was so active that her name appears forty-one times in the index of the important “Appendix IX” report compiled by Congress in 1944. The woman seemed to be involved in every lousy communist front-group or operation under the sun. She was without shame. No wonder she was ultimately so wounded that she fell to her knees one day and came to Fulton Sheen and the Roman Catholic Church for healing.

The Hand of Fulton Sheen

Bella Dodd would not crawl out of the pit of her communist atheism for years. Helping her climb out was Fulton Sheen, who brought her back into full communion with the faith of her youth.⁴⁵¹

Sheen had not initiated the contact. Bella wrote about the process openly in 1954 in *School of Darkness*. She recalled that it was the fall of

1950 and she had been in Washington testifying. A friend, Congressman Christopher McGrath, who represented her old East Bronx neighborhood, discerned her unease and anxiety and asked if she would like to visit a priest. "You look harassed and disturbed, Bella. Isn't there something I can do for you?" He sensed she was in danger and might need protection. When she refused security, he suggested prayer and a priest: "Bella, would you like to see a priest?"⁴⁵²

The years of communist atheism had hardened Bella to that very prospect, but now she felt it was something she could no longer resist. "Yes, I would," she said with an intensity that surprised herself. He responded, "Perhaps we can reach Monsignor Sheen at Catholic University." Working with his secretary, Rose, McGrath arranged for Bella to meet Sheen at the priest's home later that evening.

On her way there, Bella felt the "tiny flame of longing for faith within me." Even then, she felt like looking for an "easy exit" as Sheen walked into the room, "his silver cross gleaming, a warm smile in his eyes." Her reservations vanished. He held out his hand: "Doctor, I'm glad you've come." He observed, "Dr. Dodd, you look unhappy." She said, "Why do you say that?" Sheen replied, "Oh, I suppose, in some way, we priests are like doctors who can diagnose a patient by looking at him."⁴⁵³

She began to cry as he put his hand on her shoulder. When the conversation seemed to reach a dead end, Sheen led her gently into a small chapel, where both bowed before a statue of Our Lady, the Ave Maria. Like a little girl again, Maria Assunta Isabella felt a peace, stillness, calm.

When they left the chapel, Sheen gave Dodd a rosary. "I will be going to New York next winter," he told her. "Come to me and I'll give you instructions in the Faith." On her way to the airport, she said she thought about "how much he understood." With an unexpected sense of serenity, she held that rosary tightly all the way to New York.⁴⁵⁴

Christmas approached that 1950, and Bella's longing continued. On Christmas Eve, she found herself alone, wondering, riding a bus, searching, until she came upon a Midnight Mass at St. Francis of Assisi Church on New York's West Side. It was packed. She wedged her way in. She prayed over and over, "God help me. God help me." When Midnight Mass ended, she walked the streets alone for hours, but she felt different; she felt a

“warm glow of hope.” “I knew I was traveling closer and closer to home,” she wrote later, “guided by the Star.”⁴⁵⁵

She was on a different walk now. Bella began praying every day and attending daily Mass at Our Lady of Guadalupe on West Seventeenth Street. She met the group of religious men, the Christophers, whose motto is, “It’s better to light one candle than to curse the darkness,” a school of darkness that Bella was trying to escape by rekindling the light of her Catholic faith. She began reading, including Augustine’s *City of God*, and also Aquinas. It was Easter season, 1951, and she got back in touch with Fulton Sheen, visiting him at his offices at the Society for the Propagation of the Faith on East Thirty-Eighth Street. She thus began to receive weekly instruction in the faith from Sheen, taken by his keen logic and reasoning and patient telling of the love of God for man, of man’s longing for God, of the words of Christ, and of the founding of Christ’s Church. She read long into each night.

By Easter of 1952, with a year of intense instruction, Sheen felt that Bella Dodd was ready. Reasonably certain that she had been baptized as an infant in her little native town in Italy, she received a conditional baptism. On April 7, 1952, the anniversary of her mother’s birthday, she was baptized by Sheen in the baptismal font of St. Patrick’s Cathedral. Afterward, Sheen heard her first confession and gave her absolution. At Mass the next morning, he gave her Holy Communion.

“It was as if I had been ill for a long time,” she would later recount, “and had awakened refreshed after the fever had gone. ... I seemed to have acquired a new heart and a new conscience. ... An order and peace of mind returned to my life.”⁴⁵⁶

Infiltration of Catholic Seminaries

Amid all of her subsequent reports of what communists had done inside America, the most sensational bombshell that Bella dropped was her reported claim that communists had infiltrated and flooded churches and seminaries, and that she personally helped recruit over 1,000 “communist men” (by some accounts, 1,100, and by others, 1,200) into Catholic seminaries. The provenance of that claim is itself controversial and demands care and nuance.⁴⁵⁷

In her public testimonies, Bella Dodd spoke primarily to the matter of communist infiltration of the teachers' unions and teaching profession. That was her main area of responsibility for the Communist Party. Those details were pervasive throughout her memoir, her testimony before the US Senate, her speeches around the country, and in contemporaneous articles about her and in obituaries at the time of her death.⁴⁵⁸ Unfortunately, one cannot find in these same sources companion statements about her work in helping to place communists in seminaries. Nonetheless, she did seem to make such statements, albeit much less frequently—as I will note below. Looking back at the record, I suspect a possible reticence by Bella to speak to this highly sensitive matter, maybe because she was not as directly involved as she was as an education expert for the party working to infiltrate education. I also think she might have been not only embarrassed by the religious infiltration but humiliated and sorrowful in a way that she did not feel concerning the other fields she had worked to penetrate.

An entrance to the official *Congressional Record* at the time of her death by Congressman John Rarick might have alluded to this: “Bella Dodd spent the rest of her life combatting the evil forces working for the destruction of the United States,” stated Rep. Rarick. “She testified before Senate and House committees and gave information to the F.B.I. Much of her testimony was given in executive hearings and has never been made public. Some of this testimony was so damning to important figures that even the stenographic notes have disappeared. In open hearings she was warned again and again not to mention names, so careful were the legislators to protect the ‘innocent.’”⁴⁵⁹

One wonders to what extent Bella's information on the infiltration of Catholic seminaries might have appeared in those statements. Quite amazingly, Bella Dodd's FBI file has never been released, even as thousands of other provocative and highly sensitive FBI files on major Cold War figures from the Rosenbergs to Whittaker Chambers have been released for many years. For this book, I filed a Freedom of Information Act request for Bella Dodd's FBI file.⁴⁶⁰ That FOIA remains submitted without release almost a year after it was submitted. Dodd's file is still classified, over a half century after her death.⁴⁶¹

That being the case, what are the (public) sources that document Bella Dodd's alleged claims of infiltration of Catholic seminaries?

Many voices in the Catholic world have written of Bella's supposed claim. Unfortunately, their documentation (or lack thereof) is almost always unreliable. It is typically asserted that Bella addressed this issue in her famous Fordham speech and in her riveting (public) congressional testimony. That is inaccurate. So, where and when did she say it?

One of the leading authorities on the subject is Dr. Mary A. Nicholas, a retired MD and expert on Dodd who, among other sources she has probed, has interviewed the legendary Dr. Alice von Hildebrand on this precise question. Widow of the renowned German theologian Dietrich von Hildebrand, Alice, who, as of this writing is ninety-seven years old, knew Dodd personally, going back to their time together at Hunter and Fordham. Dodd herself directly told Alice about these precise efforts. Alice says that Dodd told her that the number of men she recruited was "approximately 1,200."⁴⁶² I have exchanged many emails on this subject with Dr. Nicholas over the years, and she has copied me on several emails with Alice von Hildebrand.

No one has dug into Bella's life like Mary Nicholas. She has produced an unpublished biography of Bella, an impressive work of meticulous research that deserves to be published. Mary confirmed to me that she likewise has been unable to find a specific speech transcript in which Bella directly addressed the issue of an infiltration of seminaries or divulged hard data.⁴⁶³ In her unpublished manuscript, Dr. Nicholas marshals five forms of attestation for Bella's words, which she summed up for me in our email correspondence: 1) Bella's words as recalled and quoted by Alice von Hildebrand; 2) a sworn affidavit from Johnine Leininger, a close friend of Bella who heard her speak of the infiltration; 3) Fulton Sheen's comments about an infiltration (Sheen does not openly name Dodd as his source, though Dodd likely was); 4) testimony from Albert Vassart of France regarding the 1936 order from Joseph Stalin that Sheen would publicly speak of (Dodd did not give a date); and 5) testimony from Manning Johnson.⁴⁶⁴

Among these, as laid out in the previous chapter, Manning Johnson spoke more of infiltration generally among Protestant churches. I dealt with him at length. The other sources, however, have credence regarding the Roman Catholic Church, particularly Vassart, Leininger, and Sheen.

Albert Vassart

As noted earlier, Albert Vassart was a leader in the French Communist Party and its official representative to the Soviet Comintern. He had been summoned to Moscow in April 1934, where he received orders to create a French popular front—*Le Populaire*—between the French Communist Party, the French Socialist Party, and a wider united coalition. His experience is significant, albeit perhaps related mainly to France.

According to the US Senate, Vassart later (after he broke from the French Communist Party) admitted to and spoke of an infiltration of seminaries. This was reported in a major 1960 study on Soviet propaganda done by the Senate Judiciary Committee. “Contrary to what might be expected,” the report stated, “churches are also highly infiltrated.” Here, the report noted the case of France, citing Albert Vassart specifically, and pointed to seminaries and even to religious orders, naming a specific Moscow edict: “In 1955, a former member of the French Communist Party, Albert Vassart, revealed that in 1936 Moscow had sent out an order to have sure and carefully selected members of the Communist Youth enter seminaries and become priests. Others infiltrated the religious communities, particularly the Dominicans.”⁴⁶⁵ The report gave no further details, including whether or to what degree this applied to seminaries, priests, and Dominicans in the United States. Of course, the Dominicans are an international group.

Unfortunately, the report gave no further details on where Vassart said this. It did not clarify if this was restricted mainly to France or not. Still, the committee, composed of very serious men, veteran senators such as the likes of Democrats (far and away the majority) Thomas Dodd and James Eastland and Republicans like Everett Dirksen, needs to be taken seriously. And yet, the lack of details is frustrating.

The report added that the infiltration went beyond the Christian religion. It had been especially active, the report claimed, among Buddhists in Asia—Cambodia, Thailand, Burma.⁴⁶⁶ It summed up, “Infiltration of all churches is one of the major tasks of the Soviet propaganda apparatus.”⁴⁶⁷

The Leininger Affidavit

Much more helpful in affirming Bella Dodd's alleged claims is a crucial affidavit from Johnine Leininger.

The Leininger affidavit was certified by a notary public in Lavaca County, Texas on November 30, 2004 and signed by both Johnine and her husband, Paul. Mary Nicholas owns a copy and shared it with me. I have a PDF. The photocopy is not particularly good (hardly unusual for historical documents), but it is readable.

The affidavit attested that "at a large public meeting in Orange County, California in the 1960's, I was present in an auditorium filled to capacity with 600 to 800 people who had come to hear a former Communist Party official give an expose of the infiltration of the Communist Party into every facet of American life." That official was Dr. Bella Dodd. Leininger gave examples of the penetration that Dodd detailed in various elements of labor, including teachers' unions. Leininger also attested to what Dodd had said about an infiltration of seminaries: "In the late 1920's and 1930's, directives were sent from Moscow to all Communist Party organizations. In order to destroy the Catholic Church from within, party members were to be planted in seminaries and within diocesan organizations. Dr. Dodd said, 'I, MYSELF, PUT SOME 1,200 MEN IN CATHOLIC SEMINARIES.'" Leininger added, "Dr. Dodd also detailed the influence being implemented in the Vatican itself by Cardinals who were members of the Communist Party. She said she knew the truth of her statement because 'I KNOW WHO MY CONTACTS WERE!'"

Leininger said that Dodd shared this information because she had returned to her Catholic faith and was "truly repentant of the damage she had caused," including to "her Church and the American way of life."

Leininger added that both she and her husband often quoted and passed along Dodd's testimony:

Especially when public scandal and dissent by high Church officials caused irreparable harm to the Body of Christ. This dissent was more open and obvious beginning in the 1960's. Massive infiltration within seminaries and teaching and formation programs appear to be the only explanation. ... It became obvious that the Roman Catholic Church had been the victim of a massive Communist/Masonic infiltration. ... Today we are witnessing the results of a well organized, diabolical plan whose blue print was laid over 70 years ago and patiently implemented. The Communist goal of destroying the American way of life could only be accomplished if her most formidable opposition—the Roman Catholic Church—was infiltrated, compromised and ultimately destroyed.

This November 2004 Leininger affidavit is one of the best eyewitness forms of evidence to what Bella is said to have stated.

Alice von Hildebrand's Witness

Likewise crucial, and to be taken eminently seriously, is the witness of Alice von Hildebrand, who has been vocal about this matter for a very long time, affirming it many times in the many decades since she long ago first met Bella Dodd.

Alice was born in 1923 and has gone on to live a long life. She came to the United States from Belgium in 1940, early in World War II, as the Nazi war machine was gobbling up the continent and her homeland. It was in America that she met Dietrich von Hildebrand, the renowned Catholic scholar and theologian and escapee from Hitler, who was among the first and most prominent theologians to speak out against the Nazi madman. Dietrich was thirty-four years her senior. She met him at Fordham University, where she was a student and he was a professor. They would marry in 1959, after the death of Dietrich's first wife. Dietrich died in 1977. Alice picked up his torch and his legacy, becoming a widely respected Catholic scholar in her own right, frequently appearing in Catholic media, particularly on EWTN television, where she hosted several series and participated in various documentaries.

As of this writing, in 2020, it has been seven decades since Alice was first told by Dodd in the early 1950s about the infiltration of the seminaries. Alice knew Dodd from their time together at Hunter College in New York City, where Alice began teaching after World War II.

As noted, I myself have been privy to emails from Alice (via third party, specifically Mary Nicholas) affirming Bella's statement on the seminaries. Better, Alice has gone on the record on camera in videotaped interviews widely available on the internet. One such statement, procured by Michael Voris in an interview with Alice, was posted by Voris on YouTube on January 29, 2016.⁴⁶⁸ There, Alice stated, "The Church has been infiltrated. I repeat these words: *the Church has been infiltrated.*" She said of Bella Dodd, "Bella Dodd gave a talk in Orange, California, in which she declared publicly—I repeat, *publicly*—that in the course of the 20 years of activities for the communists she recruited some 1,100 young men, with neither faith nor morals, that entered seminaries. And they were so superbly trained that

it was not that easy to detect them, because in many ways they seemed to be orthodox.”

Alice said they spread their “poison.” They “spread it out and it worked fantastically.”

Alice has repeated this many times, again well into the current century. In a 2001 print interview, she stated, “It is a matter of public record, for instance, that Bella Dodd, the ex-Communist who reconverted to the Church, openly spoke of the Communist Party’s deliberate infiltration of agents into the seminaries. She told my husband and me that when she was an active party member, she had dealt with no fewer than four cardinals within the Vatican ‘who were working for us.’”⁴⁶⁹

That, too, is obviously alarming. Alice’s assessment rises above and beyond American seminaries to the highest echelons of the Church in Rome.

Breaking Down Bella’s Numbers

Before considering other assessments, including what Fulton Sheen had to say, we should pause and try to assess whether the planting of 1,100 or 1,200 men in US seminaries by the likes of Bella Dodd seems even feasible.

Could Bella and fellow communists have done this? Actually, such a number was hardly out of bounds given what she was accustomed to as a communist organizer for teachers’ unions in New York State from 1936 to 1938. She wrote of their organizing success, “At its peak the Union boasted ten thousand members, and in it the Communist Party had a fraction of close to a thousand. Among them were Moscow-trained teachers and men and women who had attended the sixth World Congress of the Comintern.”⁴⁷⁰

Think about these numbers, particularly in light of the possibilities for penetrating the priesthood: If Bella and the reds could manage to help place a thousand communists in the teachers’ union in one state, tantamount to 10 percent of all union members, then placing a thousand communists in seminaries nationwide might not seem an overwhelming task. Notably, though the teachers’ unions would come under significant attack because of their obvious radicalism, Bella said that by 1941 the communist element remained virtually unshaken, with about one thousand of the four thousand

union members still being communists—a striking one-quarter of all union members.⁴⁷¹

And not surprisingly, these communists, working in cahoots and concealing their ideological sympathies, actually had control of the union. By 1936, said Bella, “the Communists had control.”⁴⁷²

For the record, a thousand communist teachers was easily doable in New York, which had the largest number of communists of any state—by far. New York was home to the vast majority of American Marxists. It was the headquarters of Communist Party USA and publications such as the *Daily Worker*, the *New Masses*, and others, and it was the home of commie hot-spots such as Columbia University. This was no secret to anyone, least of all to the FBI. As presented in a declassified March 2, 1948 document, directed to D. M. Ladd, assistant director of the FBI, and titled “Redirection of Communist Investigations,” there were “approximately 30,000” Communist Party members in the New York City area alone. Remarkably, the document reported that “almost 50% of the Communist Party members in the United States are located in the New York area.”⁴⁷³

The document further noted that the New York Office of the FBI had accumulated 1,168 Security Index cards on these CPUSA members in New York. That, too, is striking. Americans placed on the federal government’s Security Index were deemed (as this FBI document itself stated) “dangerous” or “potentially dangerous”—meaning they were considered as potential collaborators with a foreign power against the United States; in this case, with Stalin’s Soviet Union. If a war broke out between the United States and USSR, these people could have been placed under immediate arrest because of their loyalty oath to Stalin’s Soviet Union, which they swore upon becoming official Communist Party members.

Another document from this period, a February 21, 1948 FBI letter from J. Edgar Hoover to D. M. Ladd, reported that these thirty thousand New York communists were organized and “controlled” through “1,016 clubs.” They were spread out among the four boroughs of New York City.

So, if Bella and comrades wanted to round up a thousand communists to try to infiltrate American seminaries, they need not look far. There were walking all over the pavement in New York City.

How many priests existed nationwide in the late 1930s? In 1936, there were 30,250 Catholic priests in the United States, consisting of 20,836

diocesan clergy and 9,414 priests in religious orders. Importantly, this was the start of an upswing that would eventually reach a peak number of 59,892 priests by 1967.⁴⁷⁴

As for seminarians, in 1936 there were 23,579 students in Catholic seminaries, which likewise would more than double by 1965 (before plunging after Vatican II). According to the *Official Catholic Directory*, in 1965 there were 48,992 seminarians; by 1970, the total plummeted to 28,819.

As noted by Dr. Paul Sullins, a priest and sociologist at the Catholic University of America, “Given an eight-year formation track, then, about 3,000 men would enter seminary each year; about 2/3 would drop out before ordination.” Sullins notes that Dodd’s claim “is thus plausible by the numbers, especially if she meant ‘by 1936’ or ‘since 1936’ or ‘around 1936,’ not that all 1100 entered seminary in 1936.” Sullins also notes that 1936 was an unusually high year for number of seminarians, higher than any year until 1948.⁴⁷⁵

This very large number of seminarians and priests from the 1930s underscores an obvious point for this discussion: As daunting as Bella’s 1,100–1,200 figure might initially appear, upon closer inspection it may not seem so impossible, especially for someone who had placed a thousand communist teachers in a teachers’ union of only four to eight thousand members. Placing roughly a thousand priests among a mass of over one hundred thousand priests and seminarians surely looked not only doable to Bella but probably a cinch.

That said, whether Bella and her comrades achieved just that is something I cannot confirm with available hard evidence today, so many years down the road. And yet, here is a crucial reality: As we can see in these pages, especially in the material on Browder, Budenz, Gitlow, Johnson, the outstretched hand, the Comintern, CPUSA, and the vigorous activities in 1937 and 1938, the year 1936 indisputably fits the timeline. For the seminaries to have been a focal point of the communist effort to influence Catholics makes perfect sense. And targeting seminaries meant, of course, targeting future priests, the leaders of the flock.

Fulton Sheen on the Infiltration of Seminaries

Someone else who spoke to this effort was a man of highest renown in the American Catholic Church in the twentieth century: Fulton Sheen.

Before sharing Sheen's statement on suspected infiltration, it might be worth emphasizing his reliability. Sheen lived not only a prolific life with his writing and his speaking, particularly on all matters of the Church and studying and dealing with communism, but a holy life as well. His life was so noted for its holiness that the Vatican in 2012 declared him "venerable," meaning that he demonstrated remarkable and unusual holiness and virtue. The cause for the canonization of Fulton Sheen has been in process for years. In 2014, the Vatican's Congregation for the Causes of Saints unanimously approved a miracle attributed to Sheen's intercession.

Thus, we should commend Sheen not only for his media stature but for his honesty, integrity, and reliability.

Fulton Sheen always made headlines. He was a headline. He was the headliner every time he spoke and at every event he attended. But on April 28, 1952, he made headlines for a statement he made not in the United States but in Rome, and specifically on the subject of communist infiltration of the Church.

"Sheen in Rome Says Red Agents Tried to Infiltrate the Priesthood," reported the front page of the *New York Times* that April 28, running a piece reported by the Associated Press. The article was not long, but it certainly grabbed readers' attention:

Rome, April 27—American Communists were under secret orders in 1936 to infiltrate the Roman Catholic priesthood, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen said today.

The 57-year-old Auxiliary Bishop of New York, speaking before an overflowing congregation in the American Catholic Church of Santa Susanna, said:

"In 1936 the [Communist] wolves went into the forces which control public opinion. There was hardly a prominent newspaper commentator who did not have a Communist secretary, although he or she did not necessarily know it.

"This was the beginning of the planting of forces of evil communism within the religious communities to destroy them from within. A call for volunteers to enter religious orders and make the great sacrifices of the life of a seminarian was made at a secret Red meeting in a large [American] city."

The year that Sheen gave accords perfectly with the year that Albert Vassart had given.

How to interpret this? Where was Sheen getting his information?

As an obvious starting point, one is apt to think he heard it from Bella Dodd. The dates of the Sheen-Dodd timeline are conspicuously congruent

with Sheen's statement. Sheen made this statement in Rome on April 27, 1952. He had just received Bella Dodd into the Church three weeks earlier. He heard her first confession on April 7, 1952, after a year of giving her instruction in the faith.

It would seem certain that Sheen must have heard this from Bella Dodd during that time. Maybe he heard it from her in the confessional, or privately from her outside the confessional. Moreover, note the date and place that Sheen gives: "secret orders in 1936" and a "large [American] city." That was precisely when Bella was organizing and inserting a thousand communist teachers into teachers' unions in New York City. In fact, Bella was tasked with organizing the teachers' contingent that marched in New York's huge May Day parade that year, where she commandeered a mass of five hundred marching teachers who were secretly communists.⁴⁷⁶

The year 1936 was a busy one for Bella, as she was also ordered by the party to organize committees of striking seamen against ship owners. Thus, she was organizing not only teachers and seamen, but also doing trade union work for the old A.F. of L. She had her hand in more than merely the teachers' front.⁴⁷⁷ Bella also pointed to a "prodigious effort" made by Moscow in 1936 to marshal communists worldwide to Spain to fight for the communists in the Spanish Civil War.⁴⁷⁸

If Bella was not Fulton Sheen's source, maybe the Vatican was. Note the place: Rome. Perhaps Sheen learned of such orders given from Moscow while he was in Rome in late April 1952. He regularly met with the pope himself while in Rome, as he had been doing since the 1930s. He could have easily learned something from Pius XII or Vatican staff in 1952, or perhaps even earlier from Pius XI in the 1930s. Both popes had always encouraged Sheen in his research and exposés of communism. "Pius XI had told him to study Karl Marx and communism," wrote Sheen biographer Thomas Reeves, "and never to speak in public during his pontificate without exposing their fallacies. Fulton took the charge to heart and began an intensive study of Marxist literature."⁴⁷⁹ Pius XI was pope from 1922–1939, and his close aide, Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli, the Vatican secretary of state, became Pius XII in 1939, holding the chair of St. Peter until 1958.

Unfortunately, the *New York Times* article offers no further details, and neither do key Sheen books and pamphlets on communism, such as his *Communism and the Conscience of the West*, *The Tactics of Communism*,

Communism and Religion, and *The Church, Communism and Democracy*. Sheen's 1937 book, *Communism Answers Questions of a Communist*, which had responded to Louis Budenz and the outstretched hand offer, gave no indication of Sheen contemporaneously knowing about a 1936 edict by the Kremlin to penetrate American seminaries. One can fairly assume that Sheen most likely heard of that charge from Bella Dodd; the timeline fits.

The only other possible insight into the infiltration issue provided in the article is the next-to-last paragraph, which stated, "Although he did not mention him by name, Bishop Sheen strongly indicated in his sermon that the case of Alighiero Tondi, 44, Italian Jesuit priest who has just 'embraced the Communist idea,' parallels American Communist infiltration. Communist propagandists have been stressing the defection of Tondi strongly."⁴⁸⁰

Alighiero Tondi, a Jesuit who became a communist and left the order after sixteen years, was a case well-known in Italy, but not in the United States, and which history (at least in the English world) has forgotten about. He seems to have been a mole for the Kremlin inside the Vatican, though whether he began that way as an atheistic, pro-communist plant and infiltrator is something I do not know. He turned on the Vatican, yes, and sided with and supplied Moscow.

So, could Sheen have learned from the Vatican in late April 1952 about a secret order from Moscow issued in 1936? Sure. But it also seems likely (if not more likely) that he learned about it from Bella Dodd in early April 1952. It also could be that he learned about it first from Bella earlier that month and then followed up and learned still more from the Vatican later in the month.

In my estimate, the totality of what exists on and off the record suggests this was information that Sheen might well have learned privately from Bella, and not for public attribution. That would also explain why the priest never publicly divulged his source for the information.

Solanus Casey on the Threat to Seminaries

Finally, one truly venerable American Catholic who offered a partial testimony to at least knowing of some such activity was Blessed Solanus Casey, another popular and holy twentieth-century priest.

Casey, 1870–1957, was the first man born in the United States to be declared “venerable” by the Roman Catholic Church. He was a gentle soul widely hailed for kindness, holiness, and virtue. Many gifts and even reported cases of miraculous healings were credited to his intercession and literal touch. The Capuchin-Franciscan friar was born to Irish-Catholic parents who raised him in Minnesota. He would spend long stints in novitiates, churches, and monasteries in Wisconsin, Michigan (Detroit), New York (Yonkers, Manhattan, Brooklyn), and Indiana (Huntington). He died on July 31, 1957. On July 11, 1995, Pope John Paul II declared him venerable, noting the “proven evidence” of the theological and cardinal virtues “exercised to a heroic degree by the Servant of God, Francis Solanus Casey, a professed priest of the Order of Friars Minor Capuchin.”⁴⁸¹

The biographer of Casey is Michael H. Crosby, OFM Cap., who was appointed by the Vatican as the official “External Collaborator to the Relator” for his cause for canonization. In his biography of Casey, Crosby, no big fan of vocal American anti-communists, shares a 1955 letter from Casey on the subject of communist infiltration into the Church. Crosby prefaced the letter by seeming to equate the anti-communism of the 1950s with hysterical anti-communism, or at least with discredited “McCarthyism.” “Solanus’s support of the anticommunism of [Father] Charles Coughlin in the thirties shifted easily to McCarthy,” wrote Crosby. “McCarthy found communists in movie studios, the halls of Congress, and all sorts of places in between.”⁴⁸²

Of course, there actually were communists in the movie studios—every single member of the Hollywood Ten was a formal member of Communist Party USA, which they joined in the Stalin area⁴⁸³ —and in the halls of Congress, the White House, the State Department, the Labor Department, the Commerce Department, the Department of Agriculture, and all sorts of places in between. Crosby, however, dismisses these established facts as “paranoia.” “Given such paranoia around the omnipresence of communists,” he writes, “Solanus’s natural naivete and gullibility could be exploited with stories about communists penetrating the ranks of the church as well.”

Quite the contrary, Crosby is naïve as to the very real threat posed by communism and the extent of its successful infiltration in numerous areas of American life. I mention this not to be hard on Crosby, for whom the

subject of domestic communism is not his field or area of expertise, but rather because his skepticism lends credence to him being willing to present a letter from Solanus Casey—whom he rightly admired in this hagiographical work—on the threat of communism in that period. He clearly does not share Casey’s concerns, yet is honest enough to present the letter as written.

As for the letter itself, it was written on January 15, 1955, to a Dominican sister in Grand Rapids, Michigan, listed as “Sister M. Bernice.” Solanus Casey wrote clearly and unequivocally:

There is such a thing as “red communism” stealing into convents and monasteries. Very clever young men have been known to offer themselves as candidates for the Order who have turned out after months, sometimes after years, to have been nothing more than secret promoters of unrest and red communism. Such candidates, I have heard of and in one case at least have known to show themselves very clever and experienced and naturally older than real promising candidates. They are in their late 20’s or even middle 30’s and, of course, are not fervent at all, even though they keep the rule fairly to the letter.

Of course, to suspect anyone deliberately without a conscience [sic] observance and prayer, is a rather dangerous course. Nevertheless, self-preservation and “charity begins at home” where right order and charity always must begin. Superiors especially are expected to be on the alert concerning any subject who persists in refusing to speak to, or associate with any other member of the religious family.⁴⁸⁴

This is a compelling testimony by a holy man of God. A cynic might want to shrug off Casey’s suspicions of communists “stealing into convents and monasteries” as having perhaps been gleaned from Fulton Sheen’s published claims, or those of Bella Dodd, or even (as Crosby suggests) from a naïve gullibility influenced by the likes of Coughlin and McCarthy. Such an interpretation, however, would be a failure to read Casey’s words carefully. Note that Casey, while not expressing knowledge of a vast infiltration by hundreds or thousands throughout Catholic seminaries, personally had knowledge of “such a thing” as “very clever young men” who had offered themselves as candidates within his particular Capuchin Order. He had “heard of” “such candidates” (plural) and “in one case” knew of such a candidate. He even described what they were like: very clever, experienced, older (late twenties or middle thirties), and “not fervent at all, even though they keep the rule fairly to the letter.” He shared specific detail of what he had heard or seen.

Obviously, Casey’s testimony to Church infiltration is limited to what he saw and personally witnessed within his own community. That is true for

any direct witness of anything. Nonetheless, it is the testimony of a highly honorable and demonstrably holy man of integrity. One can only wonder how many forgotten biographies, memoirs, diaries, and letters mentioning communist infiltration exist from that era.

Of course, our fears of what might have happened to American seminaries are nothing compared to what actually happened to seminaries behind the Iron Curtain.

CHAPTER 12

“THEY KEPT A TAB”

SEMINARIES, CHURCHES, AND CLERGY BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Roman Catholic Church aside, there is no question that communists sought to penetrate various Protestant denominations and inter-church organizations, especially groups like the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches. As noted earlier, J. B. Matthews in April 1962 produced his report “A Compilation of Public Records of 658 Clergymen and Laymen connected with the National Council of Churches.” A powerful leftist-activist group of “social justice” Protestant ministers in America, the NCC was notorious for echoing the Moscow-CPUSA line.⁴⁸⁵

Bella Dodd was asked pointedly about the NCC and kindred spirits in one of her many public speeches. During the Q&A session after an hour-and-a-half long talk, an audience member inquired, “Are there communists in the clergy in the National Council of Churches?” Dodd replied generally, “As a member of the Communist Party I did know of the fact that the Party subsidized hundreds of young men to go into ministry. They went into the more liberal churches.”⁴⁸⁶

Here Bella meant particularly the mainline Protestant churches, and she was speaking to the United States. And yet, the United States was a mere microcosm of an aggressive global effort by Marxists.

Well beyond attempts to penetrate seminaries, churches, and influence clergy in the United States, it is crucial to understand that communists did

that and much more behind the Iron Curtain—in countries throughout Eastern Europe and certainly within the USSR. An extensive analysis of those efforts would require a separate book. In fact, others have written such books.

Here, I will make brief note of just some of that information, in part to further underscore the point that what Marxists had achieved in the Communist Bloc emboldened them to try the same in the United States. To be sure, they would never match in America that same level of insidious success. Nevertheless, they were inspired by their victories inside the Soviet empire. And what they did is yet another example of how the ideology of Karl Marx went beyond merely hating religion; it inspired its adherents to slither into the very houses of worship where the religious sought safety, security, comfort. Communists' sheer contempt for religion came to mean that they could not keep their covetous hands off it. They wanted to not only denounce it in their writings but to eliminate it from the face of the earth.

Spying Against God

To fully survey the array of communist activities inside churches on the other side of the Berlin Wall is unnecessary. I will call attention to a few recent works by other writers and some examples of my own.

As this book neared completion, Elisabeth Braw published *God's Spies: The Stasi's Cold War Espionage Operation Inside the Church*.⁴⁸⁷ She concentrated on the former East Germany, stronghold of the infamous secret police, the Stasi (the Ministry for State Security). Braw shows the disturbing lengths taken to control churches in East Germany, the area that had been home to Martin Luther. The Lutheran Church was far and away the dominant church across East German territory. The Stasi made its inroads there.⁴⁸⁸

Braw's book highlights four specific "pastor agents" and the recruiting work of a Stasi official named Joachim Wiegand (still living and interviewed by Braw), who headed up the Stasi's so-called "Church Department," formally known as Department XX/4. These pastor agents, states Braw, were "very active," engaging in regular clandestine meetings with Stasi contacts and "extensive cooperation over many years," agreeing to "spy on their fellow human beings," including their own congregants.

They had varying motivations. Some did it for the money—a “depressingly” small sum, notes Braw. Others cooperated because they felt they were helping causes like “peace” by curtailing “anti-militarism” in post-war Germany. Regardless, notes Braw, these pastors “betrayed and sold out their friends and acquaintances.”⁴⁸⁹

How many pastors were in the pocket of the Stasi? Exact numbers are hard to pin down, given that the scrupulous East German secret police meticulously shredded stacks of incriminating records the moment the Berlin Wall fell. Braw estimates that of roughly 180,000 everyday East Germans who served the Stasi as collaborators or agents of some sort, “it’s safe to say that there were several hundred over the years” who were pastors. This also meant, she adds, that the Stasi “really kept a close eye” on seminaries, from which it “very cunningly” recruited students and professors.⁴⁹⁰

Another historian who has given special attention to the Stasi and declassified material from East Germany is John Koehler, the former AP reporter who wrote *Spies in the Vatican: The Soviet Union’s Cold War Against the Catholic Church*.⁴⁹¹ Koehler, who looked more closely into the Catholic Church than did Braw, examined how priests and possibly even bishops and cardinals were coopted. Koehler includes chapters with names like “Spies Penetrate the Papal Sanctum” and “A Potpourri of Spies.”

Koehler’s best material likewise dug into Stasi Department XX/4, which was also tasked with surveillance of the Catholic Church in East Germany, and the role of the infamous Markus Wolf and his HVA (*Hauptverwaltung Aufklaerung*), which was second only to the KGB as the Communist Bloc’s most formidable espionage service. Wolf was one of the leading spymasters of the Cold War.⁴⁹² Koehler offers groundbreaking research on cases such as the controversial German Monsignor Paul Dissemmond, long justifiably suspected as having been an unofficial collaborator and Stasi informer, though he would always plead innocence.⁴⁹³

Outside of East Germany, Koehler flagged the sinister role of the Soviet KGB under the odious Yuri Andropov, who would one day give the green light to the Kremlin’s single most audacious act: its attempt to assassinate Pope John Paul II smack in the middle of St. Peter’s Square on May 13, 1981, the Feast Day of Our Lady of Fatima, tapping the Bulgarians and Turk Mehmet Ali Agca as co-conspirators and hitmen.⁴⁹⁴ Well before that

notorious act, Andropov was maneuvering against churches. Though he headed the KGB at the time of the crime against the pope, the assassination attempt was merely his prized crowning touch to a longer campaign attempting to assassinate Christianity entirely. He ran the KGB from 1967 to 1982, its longest-serving head, even surpassing its founder Felix Dzershinsky and the henchman Lavrenti Beria. Back further still, Andropov played a suitably dastardly role in the deaths of thousands of Hungarians in the Red Army invasion of October–November 1956—adequate training to assume the helm at Lubyanka.

When Andropov took the reins at KGB headquarters, he ordered a systematic reorganization of its directorates and duties. This included an upswing in surveillance activities and control of religious groups. That responsibility became the duty of a newly created Fifth Directorate. Among the religious entities of utmost special interest to Andropov was the Vatican. In 1969, he ordered an intensification of espionage operations against the Holy See. Such was John Koehler’s central focus in *Spies in the Vatican*. “Besides the prime target, the pope, he [Andropov] was particularly interested in the activities of Archbishop Agostino Casaroli,” wrote Koehler of Cardinal Casaroli, who became the Vatican’s principal Kremlin accommodationist, managing the Holy See’s policy of *Ostpolitik*, which warmly embraced Eastern Europe’s communist despots. He was the face and heart of Pope Paul VI’s strategy to get along with communists in the hope they would like the Vatican and lessen their persecution of the faithful.⁴⁹⁵

How comprehensive was Andropov’s order to expand espionage operations against the Holy See? Koehler stated, “Eventually, every department of the Church had been infiltrated.”⁴⁹⁶

That success by Andropov and the KGB came at the expense of Pope Paul VI and Cardinal Casaroli, whose olive branch to Moscow was chewed up and spit back in the Vatican’s face.

Targeting John Paul II

There were countless incidents like this orchestrated by the Kremlin in Eastern Europe during the Cold War, profoundly troubling efforts to sully some of the most redeeming and triumphant moments of the Church in its battle against Soviet communism. Consider, for instance, John Paul II’s

glorious return to his Polish homeland from June 2 through June 11, 1979, which has rightly been called “nine days that changed the world.”

The world watched every step of that visit as the pope told his countrymen to “Be not afraid.” He began with an opening homily in Warsaw’s Victory Square on June 2, where he boldly declared, “There can be no just Europe without the independence of Poland marked on its map.” The Kremlin was apoplectic, and Poles were ecstatic, chanting, “We want God! We want God!”

This was a game-changer in the Cold War confrontation, inspiring the likes of Ronald Reagan, watching news coverage of the epic papal visit on his television in his home in California, to assert, “That’s it, that’s it, that’s it! The pope is the key, the pope is the key, the pope is the key!” He turned to his top aide Richard V. Allen and said, “Dick, we need to find a way to get elected and reach out to this Polish pope and the Vatican and make them an ally.”⁴⁹⁷ Reagan, not yet elected president, knew that this new pope one day could help him take down Soviet communism. The Soviets knew, too, just what a mortal threat this Polish pope was to their empire. Only a few months later, on November 13, 1979, the Soviet Central Committee met in Moscow and issued a chilling edict to do whatever was within the realm of their panoply of deadly possibilities to stop this menace sitting in the Chair of St. Peter.

It was there, at that moment, on that dreary day in Moscow, that John Koehler and others believe that Moscow had laid out “an order for assassination,” formally determining to “get physically close” to the pope (and not to kiss his ring). SISDE (the *Servizio per le Informazioni a la Sicurezza Democratica*), the security service for the Italian government, concluded that the nine members of the Soviet Central Committee that day had thereby resolved a plan for the “physical elimination” of John Paul II.⁴⁹⁸

Some will debate those specifics.⁴⁹⁹ But what is not debatable is that that edict was indisputable affirmation that the pope’s dramatic return to Poland had so alarmed the Soviets that they felt John Paul II had to be stopped by whatever means possible, beyond (the edict concluded) typical Kremlin means of “disinformation and discreditation.” Communist officials were already tracking his every move. They watched his pilgrimage to Poland every step of the way. They launched a massive damage-control

operation code-named LATA '79 (meaning SUMMER '79). This included 480 Polish SB agents (the SB was the Polish secret police) who monitored Karol Wojtyla's moves and tried to generate whatever problems they could. The devious operation included seven moles that infiltrated the pontiff's orbit, one of them a clergyman acting in the spirit not of Jesus but of Judas. Yet more clergy from outside Poland, such as the German Benedictine Eugen Brammertz, were reportedly part of the effort. The accused Benedictine betrayer allegedly worked with the Stasi, which established a special working group to foul up the papal pilgrimage.⁵⁰⁰

For communists, this was standard operating procedure. While tens of millions of Poles readied to be inspired, thousands of communist operatives readied themselves for their usual devilry.

The Soviets worked arduously with their stooges in the Polish communist regime to line up Polish clergy willing to betray their native son and shepherd. Father Konrad Hejmo was one of those alleged to have been an informer. He would remain so close to the papal entourage that he was placed in charge of Polish pilgrims visiting Rome. Hejmo has denied this charge, but no less than Cardinal Glemp, who was hardly a reckless anti-communist, firmly said of Hejmo: "Certainly he was a spy. The documents and papers that were made public last year prove it." Glemp was referring to documents released in 2005 by the Polish National Remembrance Institute.⁵⁰¹

There remains endless suspicion to this day regarding certain clergy that might have spied on or betrayed St. John Paul II throughout his historic papacy and even back home in his beloved homeland. Authors such as myself in my book *A Pope and a President* and George Weigel, biographer of John Paul II, have written about these suspicions. It is a sad saga of treachery.

A Hundred Communist Students?

There are still more shocking accounts of backstabbing and infiltration and deception that could be cited from other books, albeit with varying levels of reliability. Two particularly controversial books made remarkable claims, though of dubious authenticity. I will mention them only briefly. To neglect them would make them conspicuous by their absence.

Many readers of this chapter will expect a reference to the 1972 book *AA-1025: The Memoirs of an Anti-Apostle* by a French Catholic nurse named Marie Carré, who claimed to have come upon a mysterious diary (thus the word “memoirs”) found in the possession of a priest brought to the hospital after a fatal car crash in the 1960s. The priest was alive when he arrived but died a few hours later. He was, purportedly, a communist who had secretly entered the Catholic priesthood to help destroy the Church from within, as his cryptic diary is said to say. First published in French, it was soon translated into English in 1973 and has been reprinted several times.⁵⁰² I have attempted to read the book but find it confusing and frustrating and cannot confirm its legitimacy. Still, the book is known within certain circles, and what it postulates certainly seems feasible and could have happened. But again, I cannot affirm its assertions.

Similarly, a likewise enigmatic book read by many and dismissed by many (and seems less apocryphal than *AA-1025*) is the sensational Italian bestseller *Via col vento in Vaticano*, published in English as *Shroud of Secrecy: The Story of Corruption Within the Vatican*.

Published in Italy in 1999, *Shroud of Secrecy* was composed by a small group of anonymous Vatican prelates who called themselves “the Millenari.” The authors are listed on the cover as just that, “the Millenari.” The book was an alarming exposé of corruption, fraud, abuse, immorality, graft, and still more scandals in the Vatican. It flagged sabotage from within by conspirators ranging from freemasons to communists. It became a runaway bestseller, and the Vatican hierarchy moved swiftly to cease its publication and distribution and to identify its authors. This merely accelerated the demand for copies, which soon exceeded over one hundred thousand in sales.⁵⁰³

The one author who bravely came forward and acknowledged his role was Monsignor Luigi Marinelli, who, in turn, was ordered to appear before the court of the Holy See, the Sacra Romana Rota. He refused, daring the Vatican to instead pursue him in secular courts. He would eventually leave Rome altogether, escaping the pressures there.

Chapter 17 of *Shroud of Secrecy* is titled “Communism in the Vatican.” Befitting the book’s style and penchant for anonymity, it is vague, sparse, not footnoted, and does not sufficiently provide enough names or extended details. It does, however, quote an intriguing incident related by Don

Pasquale Uva, founder of the House of Divine Providence in Bisceglie, Italy (located in southern Italy on the Adriatic Sea). Father Uva in 1956 had invited into his fraternity a new aspiring priest from the Basilicata, a young man named “Sanomonte” (no other name provided in the book). Sanomonte was an infiltrator for the Communist Party, pilfering documents for the local Communist Party offices, until he made a mistake by unintentionally handing material to a local Christian Democrat who he confused for a comrade. Sanomonte was sent home, the police were informed, and Fr. Uva, the rector of the house, reported the incident to the appropriate ministry in Rome, which reprimanded Uva for not acting more quickly.⁵⁰⁴

The case of Sanomonte is offered by the Millenari as an almost casual example of the stark claim they provide at the beginning of the chapter: “In 1935, the [Italian] secret service indicated that, during those years [or year], approximately 100 Communist students had infiltrated the seminaries and novitiates of Western Europe where, feigning a true religious vocation, they prepared to become priests. Once ordained, the party intended to place them in the most important and sensitive positions in their respective national churches.”⁵⁰⁵

That assertion by the Millenari fits the timeline of this book and the information provided to the US Congress and other investigative authorities and sources. It is surely accurate at least in terms of broad intention, perhaps off only when it comes to the exact number of communist students estimated.

According to the Millenari, this would have a multiplier effect in the seminaries: “During the sixties and seventies [1960s and 1970s], the phenomenon became so serious that there were conflicts and protests over the many Communist priests in the seminaries and novitiates.” The Millenari gave the quiet example of Fr. Uva and Sanomonte as well as higher-profile examples like Cardinal Mindszenty’s mistreatment by the *Ostpolitikers* Cardinal Casaroli and Pope Paul VI. The Millenari rightly referred to Mindszenty as one of “many martyrs of this policy” of *Ostpolitik*.⁵⁰⁶

The Millenari concluded that the likes of Lenin, Stalin, and others of their ilk came to realize that the key to doing the most damage to the Church was to corrupt it from within.⁵⁰⁷

Russian Orthodox Seminaries

Above all, the communists wreaked their worst havoc inside the predominant church in their own backyard. That brings us to the elephant in the Bolshevik living room: the Russian Orthodox Church.

The Russian Orthodox Church was penetrated, manipulated, and in many aspects controlled by the Soviet government. Readers familiar with that history will immediately nod in agreement.

Within the initial years and decades of the Bolshevik takeover, the Russian Orthodox Church was brutalized by the Marxist thugs unleashed by Lenin and Trotsky and Stalin. The stories are too many and too sad. The persecution by these devils became so overwhelming that the Russian Orthodox Church succumbed to a lamentably high degree of control by the communist regime as a tragic calculated tactic for survival. That submission merely enabled the manipulation to run still deeper.

“The alternative to collaboration could very well have meant complete liquidation of the [Russian Orthodox] Church’s hierarchy and organization,” wrote the *New York Times*’ Vatican correspondent, Camille Cianfarra. “There were other grave reasons, in addition to the necessity of avoiding extinction, which counselled a policy of collaboration with the Government.” Most remarkable among these, and totally forgotten in the West today, is that the Russian Orthodox Church surrendered to become a tool of the Soviet government (to quote Cianfarra) “in order to unite all Christians and make Moscow the Rome of the Twentieth Century.”⁵⁰⁸

Both the Bolshevik leadership and Russian Orthodox Church leadership alike wanted to contest Rome’s leadership as the primary head of the world’s Christians. Cianfarra put it this way:

Tactically, the Soviet Union embarked on two simultaneous drives. It favored every initiative of the Russian Orthodox Church to establish its authority and influence over all the other national Eastern Churches, and carried out religious persecutions designed to break the hierarchical organizations of the Catholic Church. Both offensives had as their immediate aim to detach the Catholic episcopate and clergy from Rome and establish “national” Catholic Churches which would no longer recognize the Pope as their supreme religious authority. The overall goal was that of placing the Catholic Church under State control, as the Kremlin had so successfully done with the Russian Orthodox Church, the penultimate step towards fully accomplishing Lenin’s ultimate objective of utterly destroying all religions and securing the triumph of atheistic materialism.

This strategy had the advantage of furthering the advent of communism in countries outside the Soviet Union and of aiding Soviet plans for political hegemony in Europe. The Orthodox Church was to be used as a magnet to unite all Christians in Russia and within the

Russian sphere of influence and thus build a strong Moscow-dominated Orthodox front to oppose the Catholic Church under the authority of Rome.⁵⁰⁹

Of course, Pope Pius XII fought this tooth and nail, which is why Stalin and the Kremlin would smear him as “Hitler’s Pope.”⁵¹⁰ And as for the Russian Orthodox Church, it capitulated, albeit never easily or comfortably, but enough. The Kremlin would allow the Russian Orthodox Church to continue to exist so long as it could be wielded as a cudgel against the Roman Catholic Church.

The Bolshevik leadership went so far as to provide air transport and subsidize trips by Patriarch Alexej when he was willing to be employed as a mouthpiece for Stalin at various ecumenical councils outside the USSR. When Alexej visited Palestine, Syria, and Egypt in May 1945, he made the following statement at a reception given in his honor by the Metropolitan of Beirut: “May God make ever stronger the ties which bind our peoples. I am moved by your esteem for our Red Army and our beloved leader, Joseph Stalin, who succors all those in need.”⁵¹¹

The patriarch was succoring Stalin, the bad boy who buttered his bread, and he was bowing to the communist-atheist Red Army, so long as it did not drop the guillotine on his Church.

This was what the “Bolshevization” of the Russian Orthodox Church looked like, even as the flock and so many ministers toiled to not genuflect to the unholy church of Marxism-Leninism. It was a tough line to toe and a tricky course to navigate for these churches throughout the Soviet Bloc. In countries like Romania and Bulgaria, beholden to regimes placed under the jackboot of Moscow, the episcopate of the respective national Orthodox Churches likewise was forced to follow the shameful example of many of their Russian brothers.⁵¹²

As for Rome, it did not bend one bit. When in Romania the liberal priest Andrea Agotha convened a “Congress” of some forty Catholic clergy in the town of Targu Mures on April 27, 1950 to discuss creating a “democratic” (pro-Communist Party) Church, Pope Pius XII immediately excommunicated them once he received the news in Rome.⁵¹³

Here were yet more reasons for the Kremlin to scream, “Hitler’s Pope!”

So be it, the Roman Catholic Church would fight infiltration. Pius XII was in Rome, not in Moscow. Of course, not that Rome was a picnic in those days of Benito Mussolini. During the dark days of World War II,

including when Mussolini was finished but the Nazis were still encamped, the pontiff had already been the effective ruler of Rome. He would not leave, even if the enemies were inside the gates.

“This is where Christ told Peter the Church should be built,” Pius XII affirmed. “And here is where the Pope will remain.”⁵¹⁴

The KGB “Kept a Tab on Every Student in the Seminary”

The reality of Bolshevik control of the Russian Orthodox Church is unsurprising. This was the Soviet Union, after all—an unrestrained totalitarian dictatorship and police state where religion was brutally repressed. What wasn’t banned was controlled. What was permitted was exploited. This was true of Russian Orthodox Church seminaries. One such eyewitness testimony, heretofore unpublished, is the account of Vladimir Rusak.⁵¹⁵

Rusak was born in 1949 in Baranovichi, Belorussia. He entered seminary—namely, Zagorsk Theological Academy—as a young man in his early twenties, in 1972.

Vladimir had already been accustomed to a life of religious harassment by the government. When he was in high school and middle school, he and other religious kids ventured to go to church if there was a religious holiday during the week. He remembers the school principal standing at the church entrance warning and trying to bar them from attending the religious service. “He would try to stop us from getting through with his own body and his hands spread open so we wouldn’t be able to go to church,” says Vladimir. “So that was absolutely clear: you’re not allowed to worship God.” He recalled that religious items and articles, such as wearing a crucifix to school, were strictly forbidden. They “got their crosses ripped off, which was a normal action of things if you wore a cross to school. You were not allowed to wear it.”

Thus, Vladimir knew that taking the especially audacious step of attending seminary would make him an even greater affront to communist principals in the USSR. He learned that right away.

Asked about the degree to which seminaries in the Soviet Union were controlled by the government, Vladimir answered, “Of course, the KGB was trying to control all the students, they kept a tab on every student in the seminary. And sometimes they would be interrogated on a face-to-face

basis.” The KGB inquisition usually began by asking students, “Well, you are a patriot of your country, why are you here?” The implication was that these men either served the Soviet state or they served God; they could not do both. He said, “They wanted to hear that the country, the Motherland, came first and God second.”

Starting from that basis, the KGB controllers then went to a higher level of personal intrusion into the space of the seminarian and his brothers: “And then they start chipping away on a more serious basis. ‘What if you hear something or see something that’s not really *Soviet*? Will you tell us about it?’ Many students would say, ‘Absolutely not, I’m not going to rat anyone out, because that means somebody else’s life would be in danger.’ ... And then the next stage of that conversation, they’d slowly try to involve the students into working with the KGB as an agent, an undercover agent.”

Vladimir did not know which fellow seminarians he could trust. He was unaware which were directly working for the KGB, “but they had enough informants to really keep them supplying [the KGB] with all kinds of information.” He knew of two occasions where fellow students were actually “dismissed and discharged” from the seminary for “incorrect political views.”

The penetration was thorough. Asked if he and other seminarians feared the presence of electronic listening devices, Vladimir responded briefly and assuredly, “Sure.” No doubt this also included monitoring phone conversations and intercepting and reading mail. Hence, he was always “very careful” what he did.

Naturally, the KGB learned through this process which seminarians might then be counted upon as future informers and servants to the Soviet government as they rose through the ranks. Conversely, they also learned which seminarians were “obstinate” and would need ongoing surveillance throughout their careers. They would continue to be watched ever more carefully once they moved into positions of influence among the flock in their churches or elsewhere. That included Vladimir, who had been pegged as among the devout and stubborn.

Vladimir graduated from the Zagorsk Theological Academy in 1977. He was then employed in the publishing department of the Moscow Patriarchate. There, he dangerously gathered a unique collection of documents on church-state relations in Russia after 1917—not a rosy portrait. He attempted to write a history of the Russian Orthodox Church

under Soviet rule—again, not a pretty picture. The regime was not happy with his manuscripts. Part of his work was smuggled out and published in the West. The other part was confiscated by the KGB. To this day, he does not know where it is.

Vladimir was arrested in April 1986, despite the introduction of Mikhail Gorbachev's widely touted *glasnost*, promising religious freedom. He was sentenced to seven years in Soviet prison camps (i.e., the Gulag). He was released early, in 1988, as a sign indeed of better times as *glasnost* did begin bearing fruit. After the Berlin Wall fell and the USSR ultimately collapsed, Vladimir came to the United States.

The case of Vladimir Rusak is one of thousands that could be told. The persecution he faced was standard operating procedure for religious persons in the USSR. To attend seminary in the Soviet Union, within the Russian Orthodox Church, was to live under the continuous gaze of KGB surveillance.

Infiltration and “Hatred of the Faith” in Romania

As a final example from the communist world, a coda to bring this up to date, Pope Francis on June 2, 2019 traveled to Blaj, Romania, to beatify seven communist-era bishops of the Eastern Rite Catholic Church who perished from harsh treatment, including in confinement in prison, which, as the Rev. Richard Wurmbrand always emphasized—and which the horrific Pitesti Prison grimly showcased—in Romania, meant torture.

These new blessed—Valeriu Traian Frentiu, Vasile Aftenie, Ioan Suci, Tito Livio Chinezu, Ioan Balan, Alexandru Rusu, and Iuliu Hossu—were, as Francis put it, killed “in hatred of the faith” between 1950 and 1970. The Catholic community in Romania during this period had been “put to a harsh test by a dictatorial and atheistic regime. ... All the Bishops and faithful of the Greek-Catholic Church and those of the Latin rite Catholic Church were persecuted and imprisoned.”⁵¹⁶

The Romanian communist government, brutal from the late 1940s until the communist collapse there on Christmas Day 1989, when dictator Nicolai Ceausescu was executed, tried to force members of the Eastern Rite Catholic Church into the Orthodox Church, because the Communist Party (there as in Moscow) had the Orthodox Church influenced if not subdued. *Reuters* reported on the Francis visit, “After World War Two, Romania’s

Communist authorities confiscated properties of the Eastern Rite Catholic Church and ordered its members to join the majority Orthodox Church, which was easier for the party to control.”⁵¹⁷

This is yet another example, of so many that could be cited, of how communists captured and often outright controlled certain churches—in this case, again, the Orthodox Church.

“The Smoke of Satan”

The devil seemed to have a field day strutting through numerous pews and seminaries and clouding the minds of many ministers in the twentieth century, with ripple effects still reverberating through their churches to this day.

“The smoke of Satan has entered the Church,” said Pope Paul VI in June 1972, forebodingly, in a reference to the devil’s influence at myriad levels. He was referring not necessarily to the infiltration of spies at the Vatican, though his words in retrospect seem apt, particularly regarding any smoke emanating from fires ignited by the Kremlin.⁵¹⁸

In truth, the smoke of Satan had entered many seminaries and many churches, Protestant and Catholic alike. It is hard to adequately measure the damage done. But we all know what has happened: the number of seminarians, church attendance, and the percentage of Americans and Europeans who believe in God have all plunged. By the end of the 1970s, Churchmen such as Fulton Sheen were rightly pronouncing that the culture of Christendom in the West was dead; Christianity was hanging on, but Christendom was no more. As we enter the third decade of the twenty-first century, that sad fact is abundantly clear.

Of course, to lay all the reasons for this disaster at the feet of Marxism-Leninism would be a vast oversimplification—truly not giving the devil his due. The grand deceiver operates on so many levels and with such diabolical cleverness. Still, though far from the only factor, communists could take credit for a not insignificant amount of the harm done, if for nothing else for the confusion they have sown.

One can point to the confusion created by heretical concepts, such as those found in so-called Liberation Theology, promoted chiefly by the Jesuits, which became very popular and influential in Latin America.⁵¹⁹

We know, of course, that Liberation Theology was pervaded with Marxist sentiment. Some ultimate insiders, such as Lt. Gen. Ion Mihai Pacepa, the leading Romanian spy chief who defected to the West in the late 1970s, have gone so far as to claim that Liberation Theology was created by the KGB. “The movement was born in the KGB,” states Pacepa unequivocally, “and it had a KGB-invented name: Liberation Theology.” Pacepa, a very high-level Communist Bloc intelligence official, gave specific details: “The birth of Liberation Theology was the intent of a 1960 super-secret ‘Party-State Dezinformatsiya [Disinformation] Program’ approved by Aleksandr Shelepin, the chairman of the KGB, and by Politburo member Aleksey Kirichenko, who coordinated the Communist Party’s international policies. This program demanded that the KGB take secret control of the World Council of Churches (WCC), based in Geneva, Switzerland, and use it as cover for converting Liberation Theology into a South American revolutionary tool.”⁵²⁰

That is a very provocative testimony that many will want to dispute, especially left-leaning Catholics. Fair enough, though it is rather difficult to trump Pacepa’s firsthand experience. He was personally involved in these schemes at the highest level.

What is beyond dispute is that the smoke of Satan in the form of communism had crept under many a seminary and church door and infected many clergy and, worse, laity. The resultant smog oozed into the pews, and still clouds Christendom to this day.

PART 5

THEY ARE LEGION

CHAPTER 13

“THE WORLD’S WICKEDEST”

MINIONS, PAGANS, WEIRDOS, RADICALS

We arrive now at the final part of this book, where the length could double, even triple, as we glance at a motley crew of creatures generated when Marxism went cultural and sexual in the twentieth century. Karl Marx desired to ruthlessly criticize all that exists, to blow up traditional absolutes, and to invent an entirely new order. This cast of disciples would seek to do just that, no doubt going places that even Marx and Engels could have scarcely imagined. Writing this section of the book was painful enough, but the years of torturous reading that have gone into it is downright dreadful. It is not for the faint of heart.

Exploring the thoughts (too generous of a word, really) of these ideological madmen (and madwomen) is a somber sojourn into a world of stupidity, an exercise in self-immolation. It is a waste—fruitless, useless, depressing, damaging. The amount of time and energy needed to adequately understand and then explain and convey these idiotic ideas is plainly not worth the human investment and spiritual grief. The practitioners of the ideas in this chapter and the one that follows—especially the perverse men of the Frankfurt School—were intellectually and spiritually vapid. Their notions were inane, yes, but they were also dark. Indeed, it would not be so bad if their ideas were just dumb. Their ideological nostrums were toxic, sometimes literally deadly, and poisonous to the soul.

At one point near the end of my off and on compilation of this section of the book—off and on because one must take long breaks in order to

preserve one's peace of soul amid wading through this execrable twaddle—I simply walked away from a six-inch stack of highlighted material and notes and decided that enough was enough. As one can see in the endnotes, I have suggested further reading for anyone who ventures to shove through this mental sewage.

Throughout this book, we have encountered some sordid individuals whose crude ruminations produced great evil—Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky—and lesser-knowns who did not slaughter the masses but, nonetheless, in the name of communism, operated by deceit, disinformation, manipulation, misinformation, infiltration—the likes of Bakunin, Foster, Browder, Ward, Bella Dodd in her bad days. Here in this chapter, we will meet still more toilers in this dubious vineyard. Here, too, are some freaks who did harm in their own way. They have names not like Mao and Che and Fidel and the other usual suspects who the world already knows too well, but names like Crowley, Duranty, Hay, Reich, Benjamin, Alinsky, Millett, the Frankfurt School—more elusive targets off the radar, and who the world should know more about, at the least because they serve as subtle (or not so subtle) markers and cautionary tales of the consequences of these ideas.

There are so damned many. And damned they were by what they inflicted on themselves, on the young they miseducated, and on the world they infected. They are legion. And communism was a giant collective petri dish for cultivating them and their virulent concoctions.

Some of these individuals delved into the occult, particularly those in the intellectual cesspool that was Germany, but also in the United Kingdom and the United States. They began their vulturous descent in the late nineteenth century, following the *Communist Manifesto*, in some cases as an alternative to the failure or abandonment of the revolutionary dreams of Marx and Engels. “Things changed in the second half of the 19th century, after the disappointment of 1848,” writes Stephen Schwartz. “Radicalism in politics and occultism intersected in the UK and US for some time, exemplified by Annie Besant, who began as a fighter for the rights of working women and ended up in Theosophy.”⁵²¹ (Theosophy—another absurd idea.)

Few living today have the personal experiences with the communist movement that Stephen Schwartz had. He was born in 1948 to a father who was Jewish and a mother who was the daughter of a Protestant minister,

though both were non-practicing and, in fact, anti-religious. As an infant, Stephen was baptized in a Presbyterian church and began a lifelong quest for spiritual and political meaning. At first, he became a communist, an extremely well-informed one, to this day retaining a library of knowledge in his mind. He ultimately rejected that god that failed. Today he is a Sufi Muslim.⁵²² His intimate knowledge of American communism is hard to surpass—including its sillier and darker elements—from the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries and still today.

“The CPUSA was a hotbed of sickos,” Schwartz wrote to me. He quickly flags Herbert Aptheker as a dubious example. Aptheker, hailed as the “theoretician” of Communist Party USA, is infamous even among the left not only for defending the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956 but for molesting his daughter, Bettina. Bettina Aptheker, a well-known, open member of CPUSA, today is chair of Women’s Studies at the University of California at Santa Cruz.⁵²³ Divorced and now married to a woman, she applies her Marxism culturally and fights for lesbian, bisexual, homosexual, “queer,” and transgender rights. Like so many classical Marxists, her radicalism became cultural and sexual.

“The infamous Stalinist Herbert Aptheker systematically raped his own daughter,” states Schwartz, “as did others I knew. They thought they answered to a higher morality.”⁵²⁴ Rattling off other examples, some of which will be noted in this chapter, Schwartz went on, “NAMBLA [North American Man-Boy Love Association] was founded by a Trotskyist who considered pedophilia a form of antibourgeois rebellion. And then there were the lovely Weathermen.”⁵²⁵ He goes on and on, listing groups like the “Spartacist” International Communist League, before sighing in disgust, “So much garbage, so little time.”⁵²⁶

Indeed, so much garbage, so little time, so little space, and only so much that one can take as a researcher compiling it and as a reader digesting it.

So, where to begin? The better question: where to stop? Stop one must, for one’s own self-preservation. Let’s start in chronological order with maybe the wickedest of them all: Aleister Crowley.

The Great Beast: The Magick Cult of Aleister Crowley

Aleister Crowley (1875–1947) was known as “The Great Beast” and dubbed “The Wickedest Man in the World,” titles he happily assumed.⁵²⁷ He was an occultist and was widely accused by contemporaries of being a Satanist, though certain other weirdos and admirers and devotees claim he was not. But what even his defenders acknowledge is that he and his cogitations and practices fully inspired a long line of Satanists who credit him as their inspiration. His influence on modern Satanism, and the features of his “esotericism” that were adopted into contemporary Satanism, are undeniable.⁵²⁸

Crowley performed all sorts of strange magic, or “magick,” if not black magic, and crowned that with macabre other-worldly sexual perversity, especially shocking for his time at the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century. At the age of twenty-one, he conveniently came into an inheritance, ensuring that he would never need to get a real job. Like Marx and Engels, Crowley used his old man’s hard-earned money to play around with his goofy ideas. Also at age twenty-one, he fell in love with a man called “Herbert” who (says Crowley biographer and admirer Tobias Churton) was known for performing a cross-dressing act “inspired by a famous Parisian lesbian.” Such acts became part of the Crowley legend, symptomatic of the bizarre sexual-spiritual-occultist performances for which he was infamous.⁵²⁹

The pagan cult of Crowley employed ritualistic sex as part of its “Gnostic Mass” that inverted and mocked not only the Roman Catholic Mass but, no doubt, Christianity *en masse*. Crowley based his philosophy on his bizarre Law of Thelema, a religious principle expressed in the creed, “Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the Law.” It was a precursor to the sixties credo, “If it feels good do it,” albeit more sinister.

A Wikipedia entry retrieved at the time of this writing, which stood virtually unchanged a year later, and which is the first item that pops up in a search of Crowley, stated this (warning: prepare to be very confused):

The Baphomet of Lévi was to become an important figure within the cosmology of Thelema, the mystical system established by Aleister Crowley in the early twentieth century. Baphomet features in the Creed of the Gnostic Catholic Church recited by the congregation in *The Gnostic Mass*, in the sentence: “And I believe in the Serpent and the Lion, Mystery of Mysteries, in His name BAPHOMET.”

In *Magick (Book 4)*, Crowley asserted that Baphomet was a divine androgyne and “the hieroglyph of arcane perfection:” Seen as that which reflects. “What occurs above so reflects below, or As above so below.”

Is that weird enough? The explanation prattles on, plowing ahead with still more incomprehensible lunacy:

The Devil does not exist. ... 'The Devil' is, historically, the God of any people that one personally dislikes. ... This serpent, SATAN, is not the enemy of Man, but He who made Gods of our race, knowing Good and Evil; He bade 'Know Thyself!' and taught Initiation. He is 'The Devil' of The Book of Thoth, and His emblem is BAPHOMET, the Androgyne who is the hieroglyph of arcane perfection. ... He is therefore Life, and Love. But moreover his letter is *ayin*, the Eye, so that he is Light; and his Zodiacal image is Capricornus, that leaping goat whose attribute is Liberty.

For Crowley, Baphomet is further a representative of the spiritual nature of the spermatozoa while also being symbolic of the "magical child" produced as a result of sex magic. As such, Baphomet represents the Union of Opposites, especially as mystically personified in Chaos and Babalon combined and biologically manifested with the sperm and egg united in the zygote.

This is what people find when they search online for "Aleister Crowley" and his ridiculous creed of "Baphomet," and it does generally accord with what more respectable biographers of Crowley have reported as they endeavored to ascertain whatever in hell the man had summoned up. I share this mumbo-jumbo here to illustrate to readers what they might not believe if I tried to describe it myself.

Trying to pin down Crowley's politics is largely a futile exercise unworthy of the hazards. He was consumed with spiritual matters more than political-ideological ones, though the circles that he ran in were considerably left of center, hanging with communists, socialists, and various "free love" progressives. He was certainly not anti-communist, and he particularly approved of Marxism's anti-Christian element. As one biographer writes, "What Crowley liked about Nazism and communism, or at least what made him curious about them, was the anti-Christian position and the revolutionary and socially subversive implications of these two movements. In their subversive powers, he saw the possibility of an annihilation of old religious traditions, and the creation of a void that Thelema, subsequently, would be able to fill."⁵³⁰ As with Marx, here was a tool to take down the Judeo-Christian order.

Still, to my knowledge, he was not an open communist or activist. Crowley, did, however, have some odd political bedfellows from within the communist movement, including one Walter Duranty.

The Demented Case of Walter Duranty

One of many sleazy individuals who had a relationship (that includes the physical) with Aleister Crowley was Walter Duranty, long known to scholars and contemporaries and colleagues as the *New York Times*' notorious "Man in Moscow," the mendacious reporter who filed terribly misleading reports on Stalin's forced famine against the Ukraine in the 1930s, where five to ten million men, women, and children starved to death.

Amazingly, Duranty would be awarded the Pulitzer Prize, despite his woefully misleading and scurrilous journalism. Duranty would report, including in articles with titles like "Russians Hungry, but Not Starving" (March 31, 1933, *New York Times*): "Here are the facts. ... There is no actual starvation or deaths from starvation, but there is widespread mortality from diseases due to malnutrition. ... These conditions are bad, but there is no famine."⁵³¹ This was not simply erroneous reporting. Duranty knew otherwise. He told William Strang at the British embassy on September 26, 1933 that as many as ten million people had already died. He also personally told Eugene Lyons (UPI's Moscow correspondent) that he estimated the total number of famine victims around seven million. Malcolm Muggeridge would call Duranty "the greatest liar of any journalist I have met in fifty years of journalism." Even the esteemed man of the left, Joseph Alsop, would denounce Duranty as a "fashionable prostitute" in service of communists.⁵³²

The Kremlin wined and dined Duranty, who licked it all up. The Soviets lavished him with food and booze (while Ukrainians tried to eat grass), a chauffeured car, assistants, and a handy cook-secretary-turned-mistress named Katya, who (Lenchen-like to Karl Marx) put her full self at the disposal of the *Times*' feted "Man in Moscow." She bore Duranty a son in the process. Eugene Lyons suspected that Duranty was flatly on the Kremlin's payroll; at the least, he was a recipient of the Bolsheviks' generous subsidies.⁵³³

But Katya and the Bolsheviks were not Duranty's only romance. There was also his intimacy with the Great Beast himself. Even many of those familiar with Duranty's perverse reporting were unaware of his perverse relationship with Aleister Crowley.

According to Duranty's biographer, S. J. Taylor, a respected scholar whose definitive work on her subject was published by the top academic press—Oxford University Press—Duranty and Aleister Crowley had sex

together. While the precise lurid details are not completely clear, it looks like they had threesomes with a woman they shared, though they might have engaged in direct homosexual conduct together. They did “exchange their semen,” according to the account. That exchange was part of the cult ritual.⁵³⁴

Taylor introduces Crowley to readers as the man who “commonly referred to himself as ‘Beast 666,’ the great Anti-Christ predicted in the Book of Revelation,” who in his late thirties, when hooking up with Duranty, was already referring to himself as “the Great Magister” and “the Wickedest Man in the World.” When he encountered Walter Duranty, Aleister Crowley was going through “something of a crisis.” He had just crossed the channel from London to Paris, “there to practice the black arts and magico-sexual rituals to which he had dedicated the preceding dozen or so years of his life.” He was now sensing a certain “inhibition,” as he put it, a fear that his chosen path might be closing up. “Fortunately,” writes Taylor, “he was saved when he made the acquaintance of a man some eight years his junior, but wise already in the ways of the world. That man was Walter Duranty.”⁵³⁵

Apparently, Crowley’s conscience had been bothering him. He was for the first time in his life having second thoughts about the “great quest” he had set before himself, even falling into depression. “It was Duranty,” records Taylor, “who helped him [Crowley], as he put it, ‘win out.’”

Taylor says that the relationship between the two men “was cemented by the pair’s common interest in smoking opium and in a woman.” This woman, the epitome of the “Scarlet Woman,” as Taylor describes her, was named Jane Cheron. Crowley described the French seductress as “a strange and venomous flower” and a fellow “devotee of that great and terrible god, Opium.”

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels spoke of the opium of the masses. Here was the opium of Walter Duranty, Aleister Crowley, and Jane Cheron.

Crowley was turned on by the “inexpressible evil” he discerned in the she-devil, Cheron, a perfect partner—as Taylor put it—for the world’s wickedest man. Taylor writes of how Duranty, too, dug into the evil woman along with Crowley. The two men “routinely shared the favors of” Jane Cheron, “just as they shared an interest in dope. It was an affable *ménage à*

trois: sex with the one partner, drugs with the other, a little magic on the side.”

The Christmas season of 1913 was a curious one for Duranty and Crowley. It was another chance to engage in their dark world of sexual-spiritual sacrifice and mis-pleasure. On December 1, 1913, Duranty went to work for the *New York Times*. S. J. Taylor describes the twisted tryst between the *Times*’ Man in Moscow and Crowley and friends on December 31, every word of which should be read and soaked in so as to grasp the full dimensions of Duranty’s and Crowley’s perversity:

On December 31st, “the last day of the vulgar year 1913,” Aleister Crowley began the first of twenty-three ritualistic happenings called “the Paris workings.” They were aimed at evoking the gods Jupiter and Mercury. The first ceremony toward achieving this end was to receive the sacrament “from a certain priest, A.B.” which Crowley proceeded to do at 5:35 p.m., as recorded in his diary, a precise account of his varied and excessive life. Priest A.B. was Walter Duranty, and what receiving the sacrament meant, in effect, was “that Crowley received his semen.” Precisely how this was accomplished was never fully disclosed; nevertheless, it was recorded that participants in “the Paris workings” were given over to painting “prime pantacles” in various preordained places, jumping from one spot to another vigorously, and chanting “*Sanguis et Semen! Sanguis et Semen!*” (Blood and Semen! Blood and Semen!) along with more lengthy Latin recitations. Duranty translated most of the verse concocted by the pair, “he being the better Latinist.”

Jesus Christ offered his body and blood. Roman Catholic priests, *in persona Christi*, have long consecrated bread and wine. Walter Duranty and Aleister Crowley befouled semen and blood for their ritualistic-pagan “sacrament.”

S. J. Taylor further described the spectacle that was the “Paris workings” in all their glorious detail:

The sixteenth “working” was perhaps the most impressive of the twenty-three. Crowley “became inspired and entered a trance,” in which he was given instructions to place a wax phallus, carved earlier, into “a besica” (a shallow dish in the shape of “the yoni” or female pudendum) and that a sparrow or pigeon should be slain before the Accendat, the sacrifice taking place while chanting these words, *Nunc flavi Jovi spumantem sanguine saevo Passerum* (Now I have blown to Jupiter a sparrow foaming with fierce blood) or “other such words as may be suggested by the Art-Bachelor W.D.”

Then, during the ceremony, Crowley cut the figure four on the breast of another partner named Victor Neuburg, encircled his head with a chain, and flogged him on the buttocks. The pair recited another of Duranty’s verses in Latin before attempting to commit sodomy. Since neither man was in actual fact homosexual,⁵³⁶ the attempt was a failure—as were presumably the “Paris workings” themselves in their goal of raising the specters of Jupiter and Mercury in Crowley’s apartment.⁵³⁷

This was sick stuff. Certainly demented. The ritualistic element smacks of not only blasphemy but certainly a form of pagan activity (perhaps even bordering on the demonic). Imagine this behavior from the *New York Times*' feted Pulitzer winner. One of the top reporters in the world, soiled by the Great Beast, his strange political bedfellow. Perhaps it was fitting private behavior for a man who would lie to the world about the deliberate starvation of millions of people by a murderous communist tyrant in the Kremlin.

Harry Hay: Gay Communist Pioneer

A related example is the case of Harry Hay. If ever atheistic communism bestowed a secular saint of "gay communism," it was Harry. He was a pioneer.

Harry Hay (1912–2002) was a radical political activist, dubbed by his biographer, Stuart Timmons, as the "founder of the modern gay movement,"⁵³⁸ and by Hay expert Will Roscoe as the "founder of gay liberation."⁵³⁹ Roscoe underscored Hay's unique role in fashioning a strange trinity of "Marxism, Native American revivalism, and New Age spirituality," all of which shaped his work to advance the gay and transgender movements.

Perhaps Hay's most spectacular achievement was his shrewd tactical move to portray homosexuals as a "minority" class, a crucial step in getting the wider liberal left to protect, accept, and ultimately advance them. Liberals are suckers for a minority movement that they are sympathetic to, and thus this worked masterfully, particularly as the left went secular, sexual, and cultural. "Without the idea of Gays as a cultural minority," writes Roscoe, "there would be no Gay identity and no Lesbian/Gay movement today." This "cultural minority thesis," says Roscoe, has been Hay's "most profound and lasting contribution."⁵⁴⁰ Roscoe and many others would rightly call this a "profound contribution" by Harry Hay.⁵⁴¹

It was a Marxist operating on the cultural and sexual front that made this happen. Harry Hay's triumph is one of a cultural-sexual Marxist. As we will see, the work of these cultural-sexual Marxists would constitute a revolution within the communist movement, one that pervades it to this day.

I caution researchers about citing Wikipedia as a source, but I do so here because it surprisingly and consistently describes Harry Hay exactly right,

warts and all. That is surprising because Wikipedia entries often go very soft on leftists and hardcore communists.⁵⁴² For Harry Hay, however, the Wikipedia entry at least six years running (I began checking it in 2014) has been spot-on accurate not only in characterizing his shocking communist work but his still more shocking sexual radicalism. States Wikipedia, “Hay was a prominent American gay rights activist, communist, pro-pedophilia activist (NAMBLA), and ... founder of the Mattachine Society, the first sustained gay rights group in the United States, as well as the Radical Faeries, a loosely-affiliated gay spiritual movement.”⁵⁴³

Among these, NAMBLA is the infamous North American Man-Boy Love Association, which advocates for pedophilia and pederasty and seeks to abolish age-of-consent laws to allow adult men to have sex with boys.⁵⁴⁴ The organization gives pause even to the most sexually accepting “progressives.” It encourages adult men to find and “make love” to young boys. It encourages grown adult men to become wondrous “boy lovers.” Its founder was a committed communist: David Thorstad, a prominent gay rights activist, a former president of New York’s Gay Activists Alliance, a member of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, and a staff writer for the Trotskyists’ brutal newspaper, the *Militant*.⁵⁴⁵ Thorstad had begun “enjoying” homosexual experiences at age nine.⁵⁴⁶

Harry’s biographers state that he himself was never a member of NAMBLA, but they do not hesitate to note that he was a vigorous defender, as he made clear in written and spoken word. That is a controversial position (mercifully) even among leftists. In fact, Harry’s position was a natural extension of the fact that he himself had been initially a man-boy lover. His first homosexual experience came when he, as a young teen, was taken by an older man. Harry had been (by his own description) “jail-bait” to his man-lover.⁵⁴⁷

Harry hence spit with rage at Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) and other conservatives, not to mention anti-NAMBLA Democrats and liberals and homosexuals, for “selling NAMBLA down the river.” It pained an almost hysterical Hay to see his fellow gay brothers and sisters denounce their NAMBLA brethren as “child molesters.”⁵⁴⁸ Harry did not see it that way. As even his Wikipedia entry acknowledges, he spoke up at several NAMBLA meetings and spoke out in support of relationships between adult men and boys as young as thirteen.⁵⁴⁹

Also noted in the Wikipedia description of Hay is the organization the “Radical Faeries,” a left-wing cultural-spiritual-ecological and (self-admitted) pagan group. “Our shared values include feminism, respect for the Earth, and individual responsibility rather than hierarchy,” says the organization’s website. “Many of us are Pagan (nature-based religion).” The website has a page dedicated strictly to Harry, who it calls the “Father of the Radical Faeries.”⁵⁵⁰

The Radical Faeries should not be laughed off by the politically incorrect among us. It should be of interest if not concern at least because of the ability of such “shared values” to maneuver into the arms of the ever-evolving, constantly *progressing* wider left—ideas now gaining popularity and firmly making their way into the mainstream. This includes the realm of the radical redefinition of gender. The Radical Faeries’ positions include supporting a form of transgenderism called “two-spirit,” which was explicitly championed by Harry Hay. This is noted clearly in communist literature, including this piece from *Workers World*, which details Harry Hay’s work in “two-spiritism:” “Two-Spirit is the language that many Native [American] people have chosen instead to describe those with diverse gender expression, sexualities and sexes.”⁵⁵¹

Again, this should not be shrugged off as silliness by readers. In 2016, “two-spirit” became one of the thirty-one official gender identity options approved by the New York City council for public employees.⁵⁵² Of course, a “choice” among an array of thirty-one gender options is hardly unconventional nowadays. As an indicator of the warp-speed of today’s LGBTQ movement and progressives generally, Facebook by 2017 was listing seventy-one gender options, and in 2019, the BBC came under fire for an instructional video teaching kids that there are “100, if not more” gender options.⁵⁵³

Here, too, Harry Hay was ahead of his time, a trend-setter.

“Harry Hay’s broad study of same-sex love throughout the changing history of the organization of human society and the method of his approach are achievements in themselves,” records *Workers World*. “He also made some important contributions of thought.” Among these was fathering a “two-spirit” option for today’s transgender warriors.

Harry began vigorously pushing these ideas in the 1970s, when the Radical Faeries took off. They even established several “collectives” in

rural areas in the mid-1970s and started their own publication, titled *RFD: A Magazine for Country Faggots*. They also started a group called “the faery circle” out of the Haight Street apartment in San Francisco of writer Arthur Evans. Evans wrote about this pagan circle in his 1978 book *Witchcraft and the Gay Counterculture* and in articles for the homosexual publications *Out* and *Fag Rag*.⁵⁵⁴

The faery men were assigned various neo-pagan names connected to Mother Earth, named for various animals, trees, Native Americans, and stars and constellations. These were names like Crazy Owl, Morning Star, Neon Snowflake, Rosy-Fingered Don, Flower, and Marvelous Persimmon. Some took names from popular culture, such as “Judy Jetson,” from the TV cartoon *The Jetsons*. Some were named for snakes, and these Radical Faeries literally hissed at one another. The names were captured in a circulated Faerie Directory, which evolved into a more sacred named Holy Faerie Database.⁵⁵⁵

It is crucial to pause here to understand the obvious environmental thread in this. The Radical Faeries preached a Mother Earth stewardism/paganism. This was but one of numerous Marxist-environmentalist fusions. That is a key point. Many modern communists have taken refuge in the environmental movement.⁵⁵⁶

Again, Harry was a pioneer in all of this, a veritable spiritual leader and inspiration. He personally shared what he called his “Fairly Vision,” urging his fellow radical faeries to spread their wings: “Fairies everywhere must begin to stand tall and beautiful in the sun,” Harry exhorted in July 1980. “Fairies must begin to throw off the filthy green frog-skin of Hetero-imitation and discover the lovely Gay-Conscious not-MAN shining underneath.” To achieve such a fundamental transformation in human nature, Hay urged “re-working all previously developed systems of Hetero thought.” That included reappraising previous information concerning key New Age and Pagan philosophies, or, as Hay put it, “all the data we previously have gathered concerning Shamanism and Magick.”⁵⁵⁷

Yes, “Magick.” Remember Aleister Crowley?

Harry and the Temple of the Great Beast

Speaking of whom, Harry Hay had been involved in some seriously shady stuff throughout his life, but one incident merits particular mention. Almost

casually mentioned in the definitive biography of Hay (and not on his Wikipedia page) was the time that he served as organist (in the year 1935) for the Los Angeles lodge of the Order of the Temple Orientis, or OTO, the notorious anti-Christian spiritual-sex-occultist movement of Aleister Crowley.⁵⁵⁸

For the record, I have no knowledge that Hay ever met Crowley, but Harry did connect with some of Crowley's disciples. Harry actually played the organ at these services in the Los Angeles chapter of OTO. He was hired by his lesbian friend and fellow actor Regina Kahl, a large woman who was a high priestess in the OTO, as were two other friends, a pair of lesbian sisters known simply as "the Wolfe sisters." According to Harry's reminiscences to his biographer, the temple was run by a "frail" man named Wilfred Smith, who lasciviously performed "exorcisms" on attractive young men.⁵⁵⁹

"A gong sounded and we'd get to the chapel by ladder," Harry remembered of the start of the "Mass." "The congregation sat in pews facing a sarcophagus behind a gauze curtain. Regina, in a flowing robe, slit the veil with a sword and out came Wilfred wearing a snake diadem and a red velvet cape made from a theater curtain." Wilfred would ritualistically announce, "I am a man among men," before taking Regina, a much larger person than Wilfred, to whom he would say, "Come thou virgin, pure and without spot."⁵⁶⁰

As this spectacle proceeded, Harry would bang upon the keys of the organ into a slow dirge. The ceremony in the temple thus commenced.

This must have even had a chill upon the otherwise intrepid future founder of the pagan Radical Faeries. Hay's biographer notes that Harry would "frequently" drop into his childhood Catholic parish the same day to try to "balance his sacrilege" at the OTO lodge.⁵⁶¹ There must have been a lingering sense that something wasn't quite right. That is a notable point by biographer Stuart Timmons, who elsewhere said that Harry had previously rejected his Catholic upbringing and essentially had never turned back.

Harry had been raised Roman Catholic, attending St. Gregory Catholic Church on Ninth and Norton Streets in Los Angeles. His decisive split had come Easter Sunday 1927, when Harry attended required confession with other parishioners. The priest apparently knew from another boy in the church, whom Harry had been kissing, that the two had been doing

something not permitted. Harry finished his confession with no mention of this transgression. The priest pressed Harry to continue confessing. He asked Harry, “Have you finished?” When Harry assured Father Follen that he had finished, the priest snapped at him, “You have not!”⁵⁶²

The priest demanded that Harry admit his guilt and repent. Harry refused. “I wasn’t sorry, and there was nothing for me to confess,” he explained later. The priest reached around the confessional, grabbed Harry by the collar and the belt, marched him to the front of the cathedral, and then pushed him out of the church, kicking open the door. “Don’t you come back until you are ready to say you’re sorry,” he allegedly barked.

Harry never did. At age fifteen, he left that church for good.

From Gay to Red

Another flirtation that Harry’s Church (the Roman Catholic one, not the Crowley one) would not have approved of was his growing romance with the ideology of Bolshevism, far deadlier than paganism.

For this budding communist homosexual, the homosexuality had come first. And it came with great profusion, as Harry was a sexual juggernaut, vigorous in the homosexual lifestyle from an early age. His biographer writes of Hay’s “sexual flurry” in his early twenties, just as he began eyeing up Marx and Engels. Harry told his biographer that he engaged in “two or three affairs a day between 1932 and 1936.” That would equate to over a thousand instances of homosexual intercourse with other men per year, and at a time when gays were in the closet. The closet could not contain Harry’s hyperactive libido. Hay’s biographer points to these “affairs” as a sign of Harry’s “restless” nature.⁵⁶³

Harry would have insisted that he was a born a homosexual. But he was not born a communist. For that, Harry needed a special mentor. He needed “Grandpa Walton.”

Harry Hay’s politics through the 1930s grew increasingly radical, but his leap into the lap of the communist movement was chaperoned by one of his dearest lovers, actor Will Geer, who many readers will know as “Grandpa Walton” from the hit 1970s TV show *The Waltons*.

“I was madly in love with Bill,” said Hay of Geer.⁵⁶⁴

Harry met Geer in February 1934, as a fellow actor performing at a local theatre. Many sexual encounters followed, as did their bond over radical politics. In July 1934, he joined Geer in some agitation and propaganda on behalf of union strikers in San Francisco. The next year, he and Geer worked together organizing migratory workers in the San Joaquin Valley. That year he and Geer also formed a group called the Hollywood Theatre Guild, and he became active in the “progressive” Hollywood Film and Photo League, with all sorts of added communist front-groups to follow, such as the American League Against War and Fascism.⁵⁶⁵

Harry had snuggled into the ideological arms of Geer. Really, it was Will Geer who mentored Harry into the Communist Party. Harry was already steadily drifting left, but it was Geer who plunged him into a “total immersion” of hardcore political activism.⁵⁶⁶ He escorted Harry from the homosexual orbit into the communist orbit. Geer was multi-talented, playing music with a communist folk-group called the Almanacs, which alternately included Woody Guthrie, Pete Seeger, and Burl Ives (“Have a Holly, Jolly Christmas”), and which strummed pro-Stalinist propaganda. Harry likewise performed with both Guthrie and Seeger.⁵⁶⁷

To Harry, Grandpa Walton wasn’t the red under the bed; he was the red in the bed. And Harry would never really let go, even after Geer married a woman and had children. When Geer died in 1978, a jealous Harry, in the mode of bitchy spurned lover, crudely boasted to Geer’s widow at his funeral, “I had him first.”⁵⁶⁸

For a perfectly telling statement of what a passionate communist Harry’s paramour was, Will Geer once said that his greatest fear was “people who believe you can’t change human nature.”⁵⁶⁹ Such is totalitarian communism in a nutshell. Lenin and Marx and Trotsky and every cultural Marxist would wholeheartedly agree with that sentiment.

The Geer relationship brought Harry to the bosom of Communist Party USA, which he joined in 1934, merely a few months after taking Geer’s hand. Whittaker Chambers’s biographer described Chambers joining the party as Chambers having at long last “found his church.”⁵⁷⁰ Harry Hay’s biographer said the same. “To come into the CPUSA,” wrote Stuart Timmons, “involved almost religious feelings” for Harry. No question. Harry affirmed, “Joining the Party actually was like joining the Holy Orders in earlier centuries. Party ways and outlooks dominated your everyday

consciousness from then on. Except that instead of manifesting the City of God on earth, you were creating the International Soviet, that shall be the Human Race, as one sang in the final line of the [Communist] ‘Internationale.’”⁵⁷¹

Harry Hay became a devout commie. He went to communist central, New York City,⁵⁷² where between 1939 and 1942 he began haunting the party’s library and drinking deep from its literature. He read Marx and Engels studiously. He even took advanced courses in Marxist theory with the intent of becoming a teacher for the party. In fact, he would hit the classroom not only in New York but when he returned to Los Angeles, where he taught alongside other comrades, such as future Hollywood Ten leader John Howard Lawson.⁵⁷³

Harry was a very active comrade in New York throughout the 1940s. He was also married at that time. He and his wife, Anita, had wed in September 1938 in a backyard garden of a home in downtown Los Angeles. Typical of many communists, they were married by a Unitarian minister (whereas Harry was an ex-Catholic, Anita was Jewish). The Rev. Steve Fritchman happily accommodated their wish to omit any “God stuff” from the ceremony.⁵⁷⁴ The couple soon moved to New York, returning to Anita’s family’s roots, where they immediately signed up with the Communist Party’s huge district office, the largest in the nation.

Sexually, Harry was in agony during this time, trying to remain faithful to his wife despite his overwhelming urges to have very frequent sex with men. They couldn’t hold it together and divorced after thirteen years of marriage.

The Communist Party and Homosexuals

Today, the Communist Party in America has rolled out the red carpet for all manners of sexual libertinism, as it happily and ruthlessly criticizes every traditional norm. CPUSA and publications like *People’s World* are robust advocates for the entirety of the left-wing LGBTQ agenda. But it was not always that way.

In Harry Hay’s day, Communist Party USA was not a totally hospitable place for homosexuals for a number of reasons, primarily because of their susceptibility to blackmail. The lifestyle made them “automatic security risks,” as acknowledged by Harry’s lawyer, Frank Pestana. Harry himself

said that “homosexuals were forbidden membership in the Party, according to its own constitution.”⁵⁷⁵

Hay biographer Stuart Timmons notes, “The Party strictly prohibited homosexuals from joining and did not acknowledge homosexuality as anything more than the degenerate phase of a decadent system.” But Timmons’s own sources later in his book suggest the larger reality was more complicated. He quotes several sources, from Harry himself to Dorothy Healey, the infamous “Red Queen” of Southern California, insisting that the party was not “homophobic.” Those perceptions vary, but there was no question the party realized (correctly) that homosexuals were a security risk because of their blackmail potential. In fact, a humorous assessment comes from Nicholas von Hoffman, biographer of Joe McCarthy aide Roy Cohn, who observed, “The only thing the State Department and the Communist Party agreed on was that homosexuals were security risks.” Party officials were even known to hurl accusations of homosexuality against non-homosexuals who had been booted from the party for political reasons.⁵⁷⁶ Such dirty smears were classic Leninist “morality,” with the ends justifying the means.

But though officially opposed, Timmons notes that an “unofficial subpolicy” existed below the surface; that is, exceptions were made for effective comrades who were doing excellent work and were avoiding situations that could subject them to blackmail. Timmons said that Harry was one such comrade; for him, an exception was made.⁵⁷⁷

That was indeed the case, until Harry felt that his cover was being blown, or in jeopardy of being compromised. With that, he decided—on his own—to leave the party for the best of the party. Thus, contrary to what has been interpreted, Harry was not expelled from CPUSA; he left on his volition.

One more consideration should be added. This one comes from the Soviet side, which would have been particularly concerned about blackmail because CPUSA answered to the Kremlin.

Respected Cold War researcher John Barron, in his classic book *KGB: The Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agents*, maintained that the Kremlin distrusted homosexuals less because of blackmail risk than because it judged homosexual men “at war with themselves.” The KGB deemed them emotionally if not mentally unstable. They were rejected as potential spies

or agents of influence because they were viewed as unreliable and a risk of treason.

“Contrary to popular supposition, the KGB is not primarily interested in homosexuals because of their presumed susceptibility to blackmail,” wrote Barron. “In its judgment, homosexuality often is accompanied by personality disorders that make the victim potentially unstable and vulnerable to adroit manipulation. It hunts the particular homosexual who, while more or less a functioning member of his society, is nevertheless subconsciously at war with it and himself.” Barron continued, “Compulsively driven into tortured relations that never gratify, he cannot escape awareness that he is different. Being different, he easily rationalizes that he is not morally bound by the mores, values, and allegiances that unite others in community or society. Moreover, he nurtures a dormant impulse to strike back at the society which he feels has conspired to make him a secret leper. To such a man, treason offers the weapon of retaliation.”⁵⁷⁸

Such a psychological assessment is not surprising from the Soviets. For the KGB, then, an American communist who was a homosexual might have been devoted to the cause but could not be relied upon to serve the Soviet Union, certainly not as a spy, because of the inherent risk of betrayal. The homosexual was not emotionally stable. That was the Kremlin’s perspective.

One could examine all of these varying views at length, but the point here is that, as Hay’s biographer Stuart Timmons put it, Harry concluded that “even under the best of circumstances” he would be a “liability” to the party, and “so he recommended his own expulsion as a security risk because of his homosexuality.”

Thus, Harry left CPUSA in 1951 after roughly seventeen years as a member. That same year he joined a group of homosexual communists from the Los Angeles area in forming the so-called Mattachine Society, the pioneering organization of gay communists.⁵⁷⁹

Notably, these homosexual communists in the Mattachine Society described themselves as “progressives.”⁵⁸⁰ Here, too, Hay gave his total religious-like devotion, just as he had to the Communist Party. Stuart Timmons said that Harry cast himself into the cause of the Mattachine Society with “evangelical fervor.” The group, like CPUSA, assumed a “missionary nature.”⁵⁸¹

The guys in the Mattachine Society would spread the gospel of Marx and Lenin, albeit from a “gay” perspective.

Alas, there is much more to the multifaceted life of Harry Hay. As to our interests here, the “progressive” Harry remained an aggressive advocate for homosexual rights and never relinquished his support of Stalinism.⁵⁸²

To the likes of gay communists like Harry Hay, homosexuals were to be sympathetically presented to the public as a new victim class. In a creative appropriation and extension of Marxist theory, they could be constituted as a new bourgeoisie to refashion the revolution and reject the old order. Here was an ideal group to undermine traditional norms. Here was a handy tool—eventually an entire “civil rights” movement—to fundamentally transform society’s understanding of human nature. Ultimately, their cause could be employed to redefine everything from marriage to the understanding of the nature of human sexuality itself.

Harry Hay and others like him were true trailblazers, for such was the next iteration of the evolving specter of communism, as certain twentieth- and twenty-first-century heirs to Marx picked up the ideology and added the colors of the rainbow to the traditional red. Marxism embarked on a brave new course, a new road both sexual and cultural. This, as we shall see, was the revolutionary road less traveled by (among others) the Frankfurt School and the sixties radicals. Unfortunately, they were incredibly successful, and it is now a most busy highway in the twenty-first century.

CHAPTER 14

“THE SPECTER OF THE FRANKFURT SCHOOL”

MORE MINIONS, PAGANS, WEIRDOS, RADICALS

“**A**specter is haunting the sociological enterprise,” writes Zoltan Tarr, “the specter of the Frankfurt School.”⁵⁸³

The Frankfurt School haunted much more than sociology. Its ghosts are still present. And that brings us to another perverse assortment of Marxist minions, pagans, weirdos, and radicals.

It also brings us to yet another crucial word of caution: Trying to discern the inane and impenetrable ideas of the men of the Frankfurt School is a soul-crushing exercise in futility. One must spend years scouring pages and footnotes of thick volumes (mostly in untranslated German) trying to arrive at a vague flickering of understanding at what in the devil’s name these madmen were thinking about. It would be bad enough if this venture was simply a waste of one’s time—especially given the sacrifice of more edifying reading—but what is worse is the strain and toxicity to the intellect and the soul. One is struck again and again at how some Godless intellectuals (especially German ones) can descend into such rank intellectual vacuity, ambiguity, and downright stupidity. For the researcher, this is particularly exhausting and frustrating, as what should be a straightforward project to dig out certain concepts for incorporation into a book becomes a massive maze of the mind—a vexing effort to figure out

what these sordid men were devoting their despairing lives to. Theirs was the work of lunatics. The Frankfurt School was a veritable devil's den of derangement.

Early in the twentieth century, from the smoldering embers of Marxist-Leninist theory, arose a fiery field of fanatics who came to be known collectively as the Frankfurt School. These Marxists were all about culture and sex. The Frankfurt School protégés were neo-Marxists, a new kind of twentieth-century communist less interested in the economic/class ideas of Marx than a remaking of society through the eradication of traditional norms and institutions. They brought to Marxist theory not a passion for, say, more equitable tax policy or reallocation of private property but rather tenets of psychology, sociology, and Freudian teaching on sexuality.

These men developed a kind of Freudian-Marxism, or “Freudo-Marxism,” integrating the extraordinarily bad but influential twentieth-century ideas of Sigmund Freud with the extraordinarily bad but influential nineteenth-century teachings of Karl Marx. This was no match made in heaven. The noxious Marx had conjured up the most toxic ideas of the nineteenth century, whereas the neurotic Freud had cooked up the most infantile ideas of the twentieth century. Swirling the insipid ideas of those two ideological-psychological basket cases into a single malevolent witch's brew was bound to uncork a barrel of mischief. The Frankfurt School was the laboratory and the distillery for their concoction, and the children of the 1960s would be their twitching guinea pigs and guzzling alcoholics. The flower-children, the hippies, the Yippies, the Woodstock generation, the Haight-Asbury LSD dancers, the sex-lib kids would all drink deep from the magic chalice, intoxicated by lofty dreams (more like hallucinations and bad acid-trips) of fundamental transformation of the culture, country, and world. And a generation or two still later, they would become the nutty professors who mixed the Kool-Aid for the millennials who would merrily redefine everything from marriage to sexuality to gender, wittingly or not serving the Frankenstein monster of cultural Marxism by doing so.

To be sure, the Frankfurt School of the 1930s was certainly not issuing joint statements calling for, say, same-sex marriage—such would have been considered pure madness in any day before our own. Nonetheless, this cabal's comprehensive push for untethered, unhinged sexual openness with no cultural boundaries or religious restrictions cracked the door for almost

anything down the road. When God and tradition and ancient norms are said to no longer exist, anything and everything is permissible.

For these neo-Marxists, orthodox Marxism was too old and too limiting; it was too narrow, too restrictive, too reactionary even, too controlled by the Comintern and its ironclad party discipline that strong-armed national communist parties from upon high in Moscow. That rigidity prevented these more freewheeling neo-Marxists from initiating the rampant cultural transformation they craved, which included revolutionary changes in marriage, sexuality, gender, and family. Above all, these Frankfurt leaders were left-wing/atheistic academics and intellectuals who looked to the universities as the home-base to instill their ideas—and who, most of all, spurned the churches. Marx and Freud were the gods who, they were sure, would not fail them.

Rather than organize the workers and the factories, the peasants and the fields and the farms, they would organize the intellectuals and the academy, the artists and the media and the film industry. These would be the conveyor belts to deliver the fundamental transformation.

There were many key figures from the Frankfurt School: Georg Lukacs, Herbert Marcuse, Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Erich Fromm, Franz Neumann, the Soviet spy Richard Sorge, Wilhelm Reich, Walter Benjamin, and others. The school began in 1923 as the Institute for Social Research at the University of Frankfurt in Germany. It is also sometimes called Goethe University, fittingly and frighteningly enough. Karl Marx would have been proud. The Frankfurt School in the 1930s would pick up and relocate to the United States, as its members (most if not all of them Jews) fled Hitler's atrocious Final Solution.⁵⁸⁴

Fully revisiting all of that history with each of those figures would be too much for present purposes. Here I will highlight only two of them: Wilhelm Reich and Walter Benjamin. Two is more than enough.

Wilhelm Reich's Revolution

Born in March 1897 in Austria-Hungary, Wilhelm Reich was the perturbed son of secular Jewish parents who did not raise him in the faith, or any faith. His father, Leon, was an angry man, who abused his children and his wife. Wilhelm said he lived in "great fear of his beatings." He could not recall his "austere father" of "ferocious temper" ever "having cuddled or

treated me tenderly at that time—nor can I recollect feeling any attachment to him.”⁵⁸⁵

Sex would become little Wilhelm’s obsession throughout his life, as is evident in his autobiography, appropriately titled *Passion of Youth*, which is sex-saturated from the opening pages. By paragraph five, where he tells us of his first memories, he is already writing about sex—as a four-year-old. He shares his “erotic sensations of enormous intensity” as a mere child of four and a half. He enthusiastically conveyed his experience from one afternoon at that very young and innocent age when he jumped into bed with the family nursemaid, climbed on top of her, lifted her dress, “reached feverishly for her genitals,” and for about ten minutes had his way with her (which she strangely allowed to continue), stopping only out of fear of his father discovering them.⁵⁸⁶

Wilhelm constantly fantasized about having sex with everyone from the babysitter to his mom. “Since I always bathed with Mother,” wrote Reich, “sexual feelings regularly stirred within me and I often attempted to undress Mother with my eyes.” He also enjoyed and relished his many days imbibing in chronic masturbation—that is, his self-admitted “intense pleasure in masturbating.”⁵⁸⁷

By the time he was just eleven years old, the seemingly pre-pubescent Reich was already having daily intercourse with another of the family servants, a cook. “She was the first to teach me the thrusting motion necessary for ejaculation,” Reich anxiously informs us. “From then on, I had intercourse almost every day for years—it was always in the afternoon, when my parents were napping.”⁵⁸⁸

It didn’t stop there. When a woman around the house was not available to lust or thrust over, little Wilhelm turned to the farm animals, watching them mate, gazing at their genitals, and sexually stimulating them himself. “One of my favorite activities was to go into the stall at noon,” he recalls for his readers, taking them on a tour of the strange Reich barn and stable, “while all the farmhands were eating or sleeping. I wantonly enjoyed observing the genitals of both male and female animals. While doing this, I always had an erection.” Eventually, the excitement overtook young Wilhelm, who could not resist: “One day I grew so excited looking at the animals that I took a whip with a smooth grip, turned it around, and thrust the handle into the vagina of a mare. The animal was surprised at first but

then seemed to enjoy it. She spread her legs wide and began to urinate while I had an orgasm (without ejaculation). From then on, I did this every day and extended my activities to other mares as well.” This went on for about two months until Reich (mercifully) felt a sense of disgust and decided to stop.⁵⁸⁹

If Reich were around today, his progressive pals might have him arrested for molesting animals—though surely not for his rampant sexual desires toward and activities with humans, for which Reich would become a leading light to the New Left (more on that in a moment).

Such is chapter one of Reich’s autobiography: a vivid picture of a boy dropping his trousers impulsively to engage in excessive masturbation and penetration and borderline sadomasochism and bestiality. In all, it is a perfect image and metaphor for the no-boundaries sexuality of cultural Marxism.

Given such extreme predilections from the time of toddlerhood, it was an inevitable, perfect match when Reich found his true love in the teachings of Sigmund Freud, another sexual screwball and moral weirdo.

Reich first met Freud in 1919 and asked him for a tutorial and list of writings on sexology. Freud obliged. By 1922, Reich was working as a “physician” for Freud’s psychoanalytic clinic.

It was the 1920s in elite Europe, which meant that the Soviet Comintern was in full bloom and that intellectuals in the academy and elsewhere were filling their pipes with smoky dreams of a Marxist utopia. To that end, Wilhelm Reich would encounter his second god when he dug into the writings of Marx. He joined the Communist Party in Austria in 1928 and visited the USSR the next year, where he lectured and was received openly—even as the Bolsheviks would eventually blanch at Reich’s soon-to-come wacky screeds on sexuality. Wilhelm was a little too wild for the Soviets.

Reich by then was well on his way in search of a grand unifying theory of Freudianism and Marxism. He ultimately did so in his revolutionary sexual manifesto, *The Sexual Revolution*. The book made him famous. Wilhelm Reich was the man who thereby coined the term “The Sexual Revolution.”⁵⁹⁰ Today, the likes of *The New Yorker* hail him as the “Father of the Sexual Revolution.”⁵⁹¹ He was widely read by the 1960s New Left—the children of the sexual revolution.

Reich's book is a sick piece of work. It was first published in German in 1930 and in English in 1945.⁵⁹² It was banned from circulation in the United States by a US court order in 1954 and by the FDA in 1956, as much on mental, psychological, and physical health grounds as moral ones.⁵⁹³

In his preface to the fourth edition (published in 1949),⁵⁹⁴ Reich immediately started into a vigorous defense of “the genital rights of children adolescents,” which, he noted, he began pioneering from a Marxist-socialist perspective in 1928 when he founded his Socialist Society for Sexual Consultation and Sexual Research in Vienna. He lamented how it was deemed “unthinkable for parents to tolerate sexual play, let alone to regard such manifestations as part of a natural, healthy development. The mere thought that adolescents would satisfy their need for love in the natural embrace was horrifying. Anyone who even mentioned these rights was slandered.” Reich regretted that even fellow socialists and communists, not to mention members of all religious denominations, had resisted these “attempts to guarantee the love life of children and adolescents.” Thus, he and his group “fought for the rights of children and adolescents to have a natural love life.” This would be his “great revolution.” He would battle for “the naturalness of genital self-gratification for the child.”⁵⁹⁵

In the preface to the third edition (published in 1945), Reich likewise championed “the love life” and “free life expressions of newborn infants, of small children, adolescents, and adult men and women.” Yes, *newborn infants*. He insisted not only that “sexual intercourse during puberty is a natural and self-evident need” but that “the sexual needs of infants and adolescents are completely natural and justified.”⁵⁹⁶

For Reich, as he explained carefully in this book, this was endemic to the “Freudo-Marxism” from which he was operating. He laid out this “new revolutionary ideology” and “ideological endorsement of sexual gratification” at length. He also identified the Church as one of his primary opponents—namely, “the Church as a sex-political organization of patriarchy.”⁵⁹⁷

With great foresight into the chaos to come decades later in America, particularly during the sixties when sexual revolutionaries like Kate Millett would use language exactly like this, Reich understood even back then that his ideas would be better received in the United States than in Russia. He saw the USSR as “reactionary in terms of sex politics, while the United

States ... must be described as at least progressive in its sexual politics.” America would be a riper target.⁵⁹⁸

It would indeed.

Reich’s atheistic views—which were atheistic-*Marxist* views—cannot be separated from this crowning work of his. To be sure, his faith sojourn would become a complicated one. By the end of his life, his hostility toward religion and the religious seemed to mellow. He cooled somewhat in his outright contempt for religious belief, or at least of spirituality, becoming increasingly sympathetic toward spiritual concerns.⁵⁹⁹ By 1951, he surprisingly wrote an interesting and complicated book titled *The Murder of Christ: The Emotional Plague of Mankind*. While that book is sympathetic to Jesus Christ, it rejects Christ’s Messianic divinity and the teachings of the apostles and Christianity.⁶⁰⁰ He believed that Christ mistakenly believed he was the Messiah. Reich felt that the simple teachings of Jesus, which he appreciated and liked, had become hopelessly distorted and erroneously mystified through centuries of Church rule. He also rejected Jewish teachings, including those that Christ invoked in his Messianic mission.⁶⁰¹

Reich would, to his credit, according to two of his biographers, turn fully against the occult and so-called “psychic phenomena.”⁶⁰²

At the time of the writing of his *The Sexual Revolution*, however, Wilhelm Reich was ensconced in the pit of his atheist-Marxist-Freudian worldview. Two scholars of Reich, W. Edward Mann and Edward Hoffman, note that the earliest statements from Reich on religion came during the late 1920s, when he was closely involved with first the socialist and then the communist movements. They observe, “He adopted the conventional Marxist attitude toward religion: one of general contempt. He believed that religious feeling was indeed the opiate of the masses and one of the chief means by which the ruling class maintained its hold.” In particular, “Reich regarded orthodox religion as simply a major social institution by which political revolution was repressed.” He also shared the view of Freud (who called himself a “godless Jew”) that all religion was based on illusion—at best a kind of psychological crutch (Marx’s view as well).⁶⁰³ Reich asked, “How can seemingly intelligent and rational people believe the most illogical and preposterous things in the name of religion?”⁶⁰⁴

Reich particularly disliked the religious “taboos” against sexual “expression” that he believed the churches had irrationally established. This

he called a “compulsory suppression of sexuality,” which included “the struggle to resist the temptation to masturbate,” a desire “experienced by every adolescent and every child” (particularly the young Reich).⁶⁰⁵

In all, what we have here in Wilhelm Reich, *pater familias* of the Sexual Revolution, was a bizarre and amoral (and obviously immoral) form of sexuality, fully at odds with the Church. This was a direct product of his Freudianism and his atheistic Marxism. Here was a man fully separated from a religious tradition, whether Jewish or Christian, and who thus proceeded to invent his own sexuality and morality—his own rules and his own truths. Even that might not be so bad if his ideas were confined merely to himself and his farm animals. But unfortunately, the children of the sixties were eagerly awaiting his ideas and embraced his calls for unrestrained sexual expression.

Wilhelm Reich, Freudian-Marxist, had launched a sexual revolution.

Satan and Walter Benjamin

Another purveyor of despair from the Frankfurt School worthy of mention is Walter Benjamin.

Benjamin was born in July 1892 in Berlin and raised in that same European Babylon as Wilhelm Reich.⁶⁰⁶ For his mis-education, he haunted some of the same universities that corrupted the minds of Karl Marx and other would-be transformers of human nature—namely, the University of Berlin and the University of Freiburg. His closest colleagues in the Marxist world were Bertolt Brecht, the playwright dubbed “Minstrel of the Soviet GPU” (a pal of America’s Hollywood reds), and Theodor Adorno, a veritable virtuoso of destructiveness. Via Adorno and Max Horkheimer, the mastermind behind the financing and operating and relocating of the Frankfurt School to the United States,⁶⁰⁷ Benjamin was able to secure Frankfurt School money for his projects. His most famous work was his last, *On the Concept of History* (1940).⁶⁰⁸

Like other members of the Frankfurt School, Walter Benjamin was Jewish, and thus likewise (fortunately) escaped the Nazis in the 1930s but (unfortunately) took his chaos elsewhere. He fled to Paris, where for the first of several times he considered killing himself. He met a tragic end when, in September 1940, he committed suicide in Catalonia, Spain. His nostrums for the West at large were likewise suicidal, as he joined his

Frankfurt School comrades in seeking death for the best traditions and timeless truths the West had to offer. Benjamin stands out with Reich as among the weirdest of the cultural Marxists (no small feat, as the likes of Georg Lukacs offered stiff competition). And like Reich, he was a man who seemed to have tapped into some dark forces.

Benjamin's early post-modern worldview was heavily impacted by what he perceived as the failures of the "old way" of doing things. World War I had demonstrated in Benjamin's mind that the traditional, capitalist economic-political order was doomed. The carnage of the war and Nietzsche's death of God moved him into an aesthetic existentialism that left him hungering for a "great transformation."⁶⁰⁹ But that wasn't all.

Walter Benjamin had a fascination with the satanic and the "daemonic," the latter in particular playing a role in his conception of "critical practice."⁶¹⁰ Writers on Benjamin contend that he preferred the term "daemonic" for its political significance. Among them, Donna Roberts and Daniel Garza Usabiaga offer a succinct exposition of the role of the satanic in Benjamin's writing in their work *The Use Value of Lucifer: A Comparative Analysis of the Figures of Lucifer and Satan in the Writings of Roger Caillois and Walter Benjamin in the 1930s*.⁶¹¹

While in his Parisian exile following the Nazi takeover, Benjamin became acquainted with surrealist thought.⁶¹² Surrealism had a long tradition of dabbling in the satanic. That tradition had origins in the Dadaist movement, an artistic movement which critiqued "bourgeois culture." Dada harbored a disdain for established authority, especially the established religious order. (Dada, or Dadaism, was an early twentieth-century avant-garde art movement popular in certain European circles.) Hugo Ball, the leader of Dada art, viewed himself as a heretic, and did a yeoman's job showing it. On one occasion, Ball gave a performance which he described as a "synthesis of the romantic, dandyish, and demonic theories of the nineteenth-century."⁶¹³ Ball fancied dressing as a "magical bishop" while performing ceremonies which mocked traditional Christianity.⁶¹⁴

The surrealists launched a variety of attacks against Christianity via both visual and written works of sacrilege during the 1920s and 1930s.⁶¹⁵ For example, Man Ray's *Monument a D.A.F. de Sade* (1933) featured an inverted cross which framed a female buttock.⁶¹⁶ Similarly, the surrealist Lewis Kachur's work *The Blessed Virgin Chastises the Infant Jesus Before*

Three Witnesses depicted the Virgin Mary (complete with halo) holding down the infant Jesus while spanking his bare bottom.⁶¹⁷ (If these guys were around today, they would be prime candidates for a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.)

Drawing from this Romantic/Surrealist pit, Walter Benjamin integrated his interpretation of the daemonic. To be sure, while Benjamin supposedly never fully systematized his notions of the satanic/daemonic, he did reference or tap into these concepts in several of his works.⁶¹⁸ Sometimes in quite disturbing ways.

For instance, Paul Klee's famous monoprint *Angelus Novus*, or New Angel, is central to Benjamin's integration of the philosophy of history (for which Benjamin is best known).⁶¹⁹ Benjamin went so far as to not only interpret the image but purchase the actual print in 1921. The painting is often referred to as Benjamin's "angel of history." Benjamin's understanding of *Angelus Novus* evolved over time, but by 1933, he was ascribing satanic qualities to the monoprint. He discerned in the Angel "satanic features—with a half suppressed smile" and clawed feet that "preferred to free men by taking them."⁶²⁰ His long-time friend Gershom Scholem candidly observed in his essay "Walter Benjamin and his Angel" that Benjamin understood *Angelus Novus* to have "satanic attributes."⁶²¹ Scholem noted that Benjamin's observations came during a "satanic phase," during which Benjamin smoked hashish as a means of "profane illumination."⁶²²

Yet again, here was another Marxist smoking opium and having hallucinations if not supernatural visions. When Marxists made fun of "the masses" and their religious opium, maybe they should have looked in the mirror.

Benjamin seemed to especially like *Angelus Novus* as a symbol of rebellion against the *repressive* status quo, particularly the Western culture of "commodity."⁶²³ One scholar of Benjamin writes that his interpretation of the New Angel was lapped up by other leftists, who came to relish Benjamin's rendering, thus elevating the *Angelus Novus* to the level of "icon of the left."⁶²⁴

Walter Benjamin's interest in Satanism is as complex as it is unsettling. At its core, however, he seemed to view Satan as a triumphant symbol of rebellion (recall that Michael Bakunin acknowledged Satan for similar

reasons, and we will see that Saul Alinsky did as well). Note, then, the similarity between Benjamin's understanding and that of Surrealist/Romantic Satanism: both viewed the moral status quo of Western civilization as repressive, and Satan as liberatingly triumphant against "moral authoritarianism."

For the record, the modern Church of Satan claims atheism. The Church of Satan's official website states, "We do not believe in God, we are atheists."⁶²⁵ (This is eerily verbatim to Vladimir Lenin's October 1920 statement on behalf of Soviet communists: "We do not believe in God."⁶²⁶) In fact, the website asserts, "we do not believe in Satan as a being or person."⁶²⁷

This begs the question: if the Church of Satan does not actually believe that Satan exists, then why does it invoke him as its namesake? Its answer: "Satan ... is a symbol of pride, liberty, and individualism."

Again, that is the spirit of Bakunin and other Marxists and socialists we have seen in this book.

What is particularly clear is that these Satanists seek to remove God from the center of the universe and replace God with man—akin to communists' goals. To repeat, as Whittaker Chambers said of communists' first and most fundamental ambition: *Ye shall be as gods*.

To the Church of Satan—echoing yet again Karl Marx's buddy Michael Bakunin—Satan represents rebellion against the *artificial constraints* placed upon man by religion, specifically Christianity. *The Satanic Bible* preaches the complete rejection of any creed that invokes the "authority of a 'divine' nature." There is also a rejection, then, not just of the Creator, but of any notion of the existence of a natural law let alone a biblical law—of a set system of moral codes and absolutes. Thus, Satanism offers its adherents a system of their own to rebel against these "constructs."

That brings us back to Walter Benjamin. Both Benjamin and the Church of Satan draw from Satan as a preferred symbol of rebellion. The Western/Christian tradition is not merely spurned but despised.

One could take this connection further and draw a parallel between Satanism and the so-called "critical theory" pioneered by the Frankfurt School. The Frankfurt School sought to dispel a traditional/Christian understanding of society and instead desired to set society free from the constraints of historical Western culture. As Max Horkheimer noted, the

goal of critical theory is “to liberate human beings from the circumstances that enslave them.”⁶²⁸ These “circumstances” are the traditional Western institutions and moral norms that have held together the Judeo-Christian world for millennia.

For culture-focused Marxists, these institutions had to be dismantled. Literally speaking, to hell with them.

Critical Theory’s Insidious Roots

Alas, this brings us to a closer understanding of critical theory. What is often termed (for better or worse) “cultural Marxism,” or Marxism operating on the cultural front, is more often or formally referred to in the academy as “critical theory.”⁶²⁹

Today, in the twenty-first century, much of the more culturally inclined Marxism flies under that banner. There are entire academic departments at universities dedicated to critical theory. Tellingly, most of these academic proponents of Marxism are not economics or political science professors, or historians, most of whom know better, but faculty from English departments. Only in our intellectually bankrupt universities could these vapid viewpoints get a following let alone a hearing.

There seems to be an ever-widening panoply of these Marxists. The numbers evolve as the Marxism itself evolves. Today, there are even *gender* Marxists in the academy. There are, for instance, self-described “queer theorists” and academicians engaged in “intersectionality” who are Marxists focused on cultural work.

Above all, these Marxists are about culture. Culture, culture, culture.

If one Googles “critical theory,” the first thing that pops up is a boxed definition that states: “**crit-i-cal the-o-ry**, *noun*, a philosophical approach to culture, and especially to literature, that seeks to confront the social, historical, and ideological forces and structures that produce and constrain it. The term is applied particularly to the work of the Frankfurt School.”⁶³⁰

That is precisely correct. Note the words “culture” and “Frankfurt School.” Modern critical theory has grown out of that early Freudian-Marxism of the Frankfurt School.

Jason A. Josephson-Storm, a scholar who published a book on the subject with the University of Chicago Press in 2017, states in his

systematic examination, “I locate the origins of much of critical theory in the occult milieu of fin-de-siecle France and Germany, where an alternative to modernity arose that presented itself first and foremost in reference to spiritualism, paganism, Hermeticism, mysticism, and magic.” He focuses specifically on the controversial German poet and neo-pagan mystic Ludwig Klages—namely, Klages’s influence on a number of key critical theorists, particularly Walter Benjamin.⁶³¹

For the record, Josephson-Storm is hardly alone among scholars in making this connection. In their 1992 journal article “Ludwig Klages (1872-1956) and the Origins of Critical Theory,” Georg Stauth and Bryan S. Turner likewise “challenge the traditional view that the Frankfurt School and critical theory were primarily (even exclusively) influenced by the legacy of classical Marxism.” They, too, point to Klages (among other sources) and highlight the thought of Walter Benjamin.⁶³² They and still other scholars, such as Nitzan Lebovic of UCLA, have underscored (likewise in refereed journal articles) Benjamin’s fascination with the *Lebensphilosophie* thinking of Klages.⁶³³ Further back, friends and contemporaries wrote of how Benjamin went to Munich to seek out Klages, whose writings “attracted him greatly.”⁶³⁴

This is not an exhaustive presentation of the literature (academic or popular) on this subject. More articles could be cited. The point is that what I am laying out here was not my invention nor my exaggeration. Critical theory has many dubious tentacles that reach well beyond Marxism into other forms of paganism, esotericism, Magick, if not occultism.⁶³⁵

Importantly, Josephson-Storm does not endeavor to condemn or even criticize critical theory. Not at all. His tone appears sympathetic. Nonetheless, his research takes him to those conclusions, most notably in his chapter “Dialectic of Darkness: The Magical Foundations of Critical Theory.” That chapter, and the entire book, is extremely illuminating. To cite just one of numerous disturbing examples, he discusses the influence of Klages and his Cosmic Circle (and its occult philosophy) not only on Benjamin but on leading Frankfurt School members and even founders, such as Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Georg Lukacs, and Jurgen Habermas—all of whom, Josephson-Storm notes, had read and cited Klages’s work.⁶³⁶ (Habermas took his PhD at the University of Bonn, the haunt of Marx and Bruno Bauer.) He sees in all of it an “uncanny

resemblance” between critical theory and “the heart of magical philosophy.”⁶³⁷

“All told,” sums up Josephson-Storm, “it would appear that critical theory’s proximate other was the occult.”⁶³⁸

This was a Marxist philosophical system that was not merely anti-Christian but indisputably pagan, if not demonic. Here was another disturbing confluence of the devil and Karl Marx.

Lucifer and Saul Alinsky

Speaking of disturbing confluences, the inspirations behind famed radical Saul Alinsky are likewise troubling and hard to pin down. Not hard to find, however, is his acknowledgment to Lucifer, which comes at the start of his most famous work, *Rules for Radicals*. Kicking off his opus to radicalism and community organizing, Alinsky offered this curious opening acknowledgment: “Lest we forget at least an over-the-shoulder acknowledgment to the very first radical: from all our legends, mythology, and history ... the first radical known to man who rebelled against the establishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom—Lucifer.”

Yes, Saul Alinsky, icon of the political left, whose admirers include Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, commenced his magnum opus—the one for which he is hailed by progressives, a book not only read by Clinton but used as a text by Obama in Chicago as a teacher of community organizing—with an acknowledgement of the devil.⁶³⁹ He directed his readers’ gaze to Satan as a glorious “rebel.” His evocation is very similar to Bakunin’s in his 1871 magnum opus *God and the State*, which lauded Lucifer as “the eternal rebel, the first freethinker and the emancipator of worlds.”

To avoid overstatement and hyperbole, we should clarify that it would not be quite accurate to say that *Rules for Radicals* is “dedicated” to Lucifer, as is often claimed by Alinsky’s detractors. (It is also hard to criticize them for making that assumption.) Looking at the book carefully, it appears to be dedicated to one person: there is a page at the start of the book that says simply, “To Irene.” On the page prior to the Irene dedication is a list of “Personal Acknowledgements,” where Alinsky lists four friends: Jason Epstein, Cicely Nichols, Susan Rabiner, and Georgia Harper.

Following the Irene page is another page, the controversial one, in which Alinsky offers three quotes, the first from a Rabbi Hillel, the second from Thomas Paine, and the third from Alinsky himself, giving his nod to Lucifer. One well-known fact-checking source on the web, Snopes.com, describes this as “three epigraphs on an introductory page.”⁶⁴⁰ That is a fair and acceptable way to characterize it. And the third of the three is an “epigraph” (if you will) to Satan.

But we should not let Alinsky off the Luciferian hook.

Alinsky elsewhere had more favorable things to say about that first rebel and radical, and particularly Satan’s dominion in the netherworld. He was asked about the acknowledgment in his March 1972 interview with *Playboy* magazine near the end of his life, a swan song that every Alinsky aficionado knows about. The exchange came at the very end of the interview, with *Playboy* apparently judging it a fittingly provocative close to the extremely lengthy discussion:

PLAYBOY: Having accepted your own mortality, do you believe in any kind of afterlife?

ALINSKY: Sometimes it seems to me that the question people should ask is not “Is there life after death?” but “Is there life after birth?” I don’t know whether there’s anything after this or not. I haven’t seen the evidence one way or the other and I don’t think anybody else has either. But I do know that man’s obsession with the question comes out of his stubborn refusal to face up to his own mortality. Let’s say that if there is an afterlife, and I have anything to say about it, I will unreservedly choose to go to hell.

PLAYBOY: Why?

ALINSKY: Hell would be heaven for me. All my life I’ve been with the have-nots. Over here, if you’re a have-not, you’re short of dough. If you’re a have-not in hell, you’re short of virtue. Once I get into hell, I’ll start organizing the have-nots over there.

PLAYBOY: Why them?

ALINSKY: They’re my kind of people.

“They’re my kind of people,” said Alinsky. “Hell would be heaven for me.” Alinsky averred that he would “unreservedly choose to go to hell.” That is frightening. Theologians often comfort repentant sinners fearing the flames of hell by assuring them that one must deliberately choose hell to end up there. Well, Saul Alinsky determined that such was his choice, unreservedly so.

Like Karl Marx’s character in “The Pale Maiden,” Alinsky was willing to forfeit heaven by choosing hell.

When I first Googled the Alinsky-*Playboy* interview several years ago, I found the aforementioned excerpt posted at (among other places) a Satanist

website. There, the author, in an article titled “Saul D. Alinsky: A role model for left-wing Satanists,” writes of the exchange, “I’m not sure whether Alinsky really was a Satanist/Luciferian of some sort or whether he was just joking. He may well have been just joking.”⁶⁴¹

An Alinsky supporter, a liberal friend of mine, shrugged this off as a joke, as Alinsky allegedly being facetious. I asked my friend how she knew that. She admitted that she did not, not for certain. And if those statements and nods to Lucifer and hell were something of a joke, they are not very funny.

Another online fact-checking source, *PolitiFact*, adds this caveat: “The rest of the book [*Rules for Radicals*] includes no real discussion of Lucifer or Satan, though it does talk about the way people demonize political opponents so that others see their opponents as ‘devils.’”⁶⁴²

Indeed it does. And that is not particularly amusing either. One of Alinsky’s most infamous rules is to isolate the target and vilify it. This was the thrust of Alinsky’s final and most egregious rule for radicals (no. 13): “*Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it.*” He advised cutting off the support network of the person and isolating the person from sympathy. He cruelly urged going after people rather than institutions because people hurt faster than institutions. That is most assuredly not what Jesus would do.

As for Alinsky’s politics, they are not easy to discern. Many conservatives reflexively tag Alinsky a communist, but that is not nuanced enough. The man was maddening, as were his politics. He was pro-communist, and unquestioningly the quintessential radical, but he was certainly no textbook Marxist-Leninist, nor a member of the Communist Party.

One writer, *National Review*’s Stanley Kurtz, has studied Alinsky and pegs him well, calling him a “democratic socialist” who “worked closely for years with Chicago’s Communist Party and did everything in his power to advance its program. Most of his innovations were patterned on Communist Party organizing tactics.” Kurtz adds that Alinsky “was smart enough never to join the party. ... From the start, he understood the dangers of ideological openness. He was a pragmatist, but a pragmatist of the far left.” Kurtz adds, “So Alinsky supported the central Marxist tenet of public ownership of the means of production. Unlike the New Left, however,

Alinsky had no expectation of reaching that end through swift or violent revolution. He meant to approach the ultimate goal slowly, piecemeal, perhaps over generations, through patient organizing efforts at the local level.”⁶⁴³

This was much more akin to the Fabian-socialist model adhered to by many American progressives and “democratic socialists.” It was the call of evolution rather than revolution. It was the Marxist-communist-socialist call of public ownership of the means of production, but without Lenin’s love of violence.

Kurtz puts it well. I would add the crucial caveat that though Alinsky was not a doctrinaire communist in ideology, he was very favorable to communism. Alinsky himself said he was never a Communist Party member but did not shy from working with party members. “I knew plenty of Communists in those days, and I worked with them on a number of projects,” said Alinsky in his *Playboy* interview. “Back in the Thirties, the Communists did a hell of a lot of good work.” He added emphatically, “Anybody who tells you he was active in progressive causes in those days and never worked with the Reds is a goddamn liar. Their platform stood for all the right things.” He contended that “the party in those days was on the right side and did considerable good.”⁶⁴⁴

That is quite a testimony for a purported non-communist: note that Alinsky contended that the Communist Party “stood for all the right things,” that it “was on the right side,” and that it “did considerable good.” He was referring to the Communist Party of the 1930s; the height of the Stalin era. This was precisely the period that American Communist Party members pledged a loyalty oath to Stalin’s USSR and toward the goal of a Moscow-directed “Soviet America.” Those were Alinsky’s pals that he worked with, who did a *hell of a lot of good work*.

And so, Saul Alinsky was not a communist? Technically, formally, no—even as, ideologically, and physically, he was not far removed from the party.

In his 1972 interview with *Playboy*, nearing the end of his life, Alinsky stated, “I’ve never joined any organization—not even the ones I’ve organized myself. I prize my own independence too much. And philosophically, I could never accept any rigid dogma or ideology, whether it’s Christianity or Marxism.”

That was certainly true of Christianity. There were no acknowledgments to Christ at the start of *Rules for Radicals*. No, only to Lucifer.

Kate Millett: Mao of Women's Lib, High Priestess of Feminism

Likewise nothing to laugh at were the antics of Kate Millett, one of the early faces of the National Organization for Women (NOW), and one of the leading feminists of the 1960s and 1970s. Kate was not only a feminist but a Marxist.

Millett was the author of *Sexual Politics*, her dissertation at the communist hotbed Columbia University. It became a cultural juggernaut when published in 1970. There, she decried the “patriarchy” of the monogamous nuclear family. The book landed Kate on the cover of *Time* magazine on August 31, 1970, which dubbed her the “high priestess” and “Mao Tse-tung of the Women's Movement.” Her angry book served as the bible, the feminist-Marxist manifesto, of women's lib.⁶⁴⁵ *The New York Times* referred to *Sexual Politics* as “the Bible of Women's Liberation.”⁶⁴⁶

The best witness to Millett's long life, mindset, destruction, and demons is her sister, Mallory. Mallory had suffered her own inner turmoil at the hands of the university system before rediscovering her faith and eventually pulling herself out of the clutches of the cultural-Marxist beast. Amid the sixties revolution, Kate implored Mallory to “come to New York,” where she and her female comrades were “making revolution!”⁶⁴⁷

Mallory went to Kate's gathering in New York, thus becoming an eyewitness not only to how unhinged the left had become but to what was festering within the culture rotted by the maggot of Marxist ideology. Mallory remembers:

I stayed with Kate ... in a dilapidated loft on The Bowery as she finished her first book, a PhD thesis for Columbia University, “*Sexual Politics*.”

It was 1969. Kate invited me to join her for a gathering at the home of her friend, Lila Karp. They called the assemblage a “consciousness-raising-group,” a typical communist exercise, something practiced in Maoist China. We gathered at a large table as the chairperson opened the meeting with a back-and-forth recitation, like a Litany, a type of prayer done in the Catholic Church. But now it was Marxism, the Church of the Left, mimicking religious practice:

“Why are we here today?” she asked.

“To make revolution,” they answered.

“What kind of revolution?” she replied.

“The Cultural Revolution,” they chanted.

“And how do we make Cultural Revolution?” she demanded.
 “By destroying the American family!” they answered.
 “How do we destroy the family?” she came back.
 “By destroying the American Patriarch,” they cried exuberantly.
 “And how do we destroy the American Patriarch?” she replied.
 “By taking away his power!”
 “How do we do that?”
 “By destroying monogamy!” they shouted.
 “How can we destroy monogamy?” ...
 “By promoting promiscuity, eroticism, prostitution and homosexuality!” they
 resounded. ⁶⁴⁸

Mallory says that the comradely sisters then proceeded with a sustained discussion on how to advance these goals. “It was clear they desired nothing less than the utter deconstruction of Western society,” she said. How would they do this? They would do so via the method laid out by the cultural Marxists, by the Frankfurt School, by the spirit of Antonio Gramsci and the “long march through the institutions” of the culture, from media to education. They would “invade every American institution. Every one must be permeated with ‘The Revolution.’”

Mallory watched it unfold and unravel. She also witnessed the cultural wreckage. Today she speaks tragically of encountering women in their fifties and sixties who fell for this “creed” in their youth and now cry themselves to sleep many countless nights grieving for the children that they will never have and that they “coldly murdered because they were protecting the empty loveless futures they now live with no way of going back.” “Where are my children?” they cry to Mallory. “Where are my grandchildren?”

Those children were sacrificed at the feminist altar of abortion.

“Your sister’s books destroyed my sister’s life!” Mallory has heard numerous times. “She was happily married with four kids and after she read those books, walked out on a bewildered man and didn’t look back.” The man fell into despair and ruin. The children were stunted and deeply harmed. The family was profoundly dislocated and there was “no putting Humpty-Dumpty together again.”

Kate Millett: Marxist, feminist, advocate for gay rights, for new sexuality, for new spousal relationships, and on and on. She channeled her revolutionary energies into a campaign to take down marriage and family, the backbone of American society. And she practiced what she preached.

Though she was married, she practiced lesbianism, becoming bisexual. She had started that lifestyle at Columbia while writing *Sexual Politics*. This would, predictably, end her marriage to her husband, who found the trashing of these norms unnatural and detrimental to the health of their marriage. Of course, to many in our brave new world, this makes Kate a heroine. Today, the bio for Kate Millett at the “GLBTQ” website hails her as a “groundbreaking” “bisexual feminist literary and social critic.”⁶⁴⁹

Kate Millett’s Demons

Most disturbing about Kate is just how far she descended into a darker world. Her sister, Mallory, believes Kate was demonically possessed. Obviously, that is a major charge, one not levied lightly, but Mallory, today a devout Catholic, and who not only studied Kate intimately—they shared a bedroom (bunk beds) when they were growing up—has done her share of theological exploration. She has expressed that observation to me many times in emails and phone calls, and has openly shared it with others in interviews and on websites. She has not been reticent about it.

“I’ve always thought and said that Kate was a definite case of possession,” Mallory wrote to me in one email. “Our elder sister Sally tells me that Kate was nuts when she was four and that when I was born in her sixth year she was poised over my bassinet plotting my murder and not in the normal way of a child whose babyhood has been usurped. Sally said that she was a real menace from the beginning. I don’t think she was ever in the faith.”⁶⁵⁰

The reference to the faith refers to the family’s Roman Catholic roots. Kate went to St. Mark’s grade school in St. Paul, Minnesota, from kindergarten through eighth grade—with nuns as teachers all the way. She also attended the elite girls’ Convent School in St. Paul, Derham Hall. She was expelled multiple times. “I have no idea when she left the Church,” Mallory writes, “as she was irreverent her whole life.”⁶⁵¹

As to this vexing matter of Kate’s diabolical side, Mallory wrote to me on another occasion, “She was definitely possessed, Paul. There’s no question.” She recalls how Kate could fly off the hinges and in an instant become an “outrageous lunatic.” She recalled family reunions at Kate’s home in New England, which would start on a Thursday with the feminist Kate surprisingly turning into a delightful homemaker and laying out a

“wonderful spread” in classic New England home fashion. These would start on a Thursday, with the whole family there and Kate “just delightful.” By Saturday and then Sunday morning, however, one could feel (literally) a stark change in Kate’s behavior and the overall ambience. “By Sunday morning, she was brooding,” said Mallory, “and you were just waiting for her to pop.” According to Mallory, “By Sunday afternoon, she would be literally on her back kicking her legs in the air screaming. It was just awful. My poor mother. She was just so distraught by this every time.”⁶⁵²

My first conversation with Mallory was a long, chilling one early in the afternoon of Friday, April 7, 2017, while I was driving on the Pennsylvania Turnpike en route to Reston, Virginia. We talked for close to two hours. We could have kept going. She was a fan of my previous writings, especially my 2015 book *Takedown*, and was pleased that for that book I had used her September 2014 *FrontPage Magazine* article on Kate.⁶⁵³ She wanted to open up to me about her famous feminist sister.

Mallory herself had been an actress and was close to some wellknown Hollywood figures. She had been through a lot in her life, but was now a very devout Catholic in faithful standing with the Church. One can sense a penitential feel from Mallory, seeking to find reparation and healing.

Mallory proceeded to say to me that Kate was “crazy and insane—sadistic, evil, and dangerous.” She shared with me for the first time her older sister’s account that from the moment that Mallory was in the bassinet, Kate gave her an ominous look as if she wanted to reach out and strangle her. “From the day I was in the bassinet, she wanted to kill me.”

Here she also offered what she believed was a spiritual explanation for this behavior: she said she believed that her Marxist sister was demonically possessed. Mallory conceded that some people think she is crazy when she says that. She even proffered that diagnosis to two priests who gave her funny looks. Nonetheless, she told the priests, “Listen to me. I understand this stuff. I have a sister—a very famous sister—who is possessed. I know what I’m talking about.” She said there is no other explanation for Kate’s lifelong pattern of outrageous and ruinous and vicious behavior that could not be fixed or corrected. She is convinced of it.

Mallory had not spoken to Kate since 1993, at their mother’s funeral. Her mother always looked at Kate with sympathy in a way that a mother would look painfully at her most messed-up child. Her dying mom asked

Mallory to take “good care” of Kate once she was gone. Mallory rebuffed her mother, “I’m sorry, Mom, but there’s no way.” She said she had to break from Kate because Kate would destroy her.

Mallory spoke from experience. Of all the Millett kids, Mallory was the one who always got stuck in the room with Kate because Mallory was, by nature, “the helper.” But unfortunately, this was dangerous. Mallory lived in New York and had a psychiatrist advise her that when she got in these situations where she was stuck with Kate, she should simply leave: “Walk away. Simply get up and walk away.” Mallory replied, “But how do I do that?” The psychiatrist told Mallory to simply say to Kate, “I need to go to the bathroom,” and then leave and don’t come back. Mallory said this was so simple as to be laughable, but it worked. Otherwise, until that point, she had not been able to break free from Kate’s grip. She said, “Kate would effectively hold you hostage in the same room with her, beating you down, tormenting you, threatening you, brooding over you.” She said she seriously thought that one of those days Kate would try to kill her. She truly did believe that.

Mallory said that Kate lived in darkness for decades following the death of their mother, with her feminist “minions” surrounding her. Mallory said these “minions” were all women—acolytes, disciples, all of whom practically worshipped Kate. She was like their guru. Mallory said that these were “old aging lesbian feminists” who “all sleep with each other, and all worship Kate.” Kate was like their cult leader.

Mallory told me pointedly that one could see by looking into Kate’s eyes and face that she was highly abnormal. Mallory returned to the “demonic” point: she said that when she would talk to Kate, Kate’s face would take on “forms.” This made Mallory think that Kate had “something inside of her.”

A pained Mallory says the one thing that has most baffled and saddened her about life generally has been to observe how her “crazy” sister’s “lunatic” ideas managed to rapidly sweep through the culture and country. She remains “blown away” at how within “a couple of years” it seemed like “every university” in America had her sister’s warped book (*Sexual Politics*) on syllabi as required reading. “It just doesn’t make sense, Paul,” she told me. “How did something like that happen?”

It is a great question, Mallory—a vexing one, a sad testimony to the flawed human condition. It is also a timeless, agonizing question: what

explains the inexplicable attraction of the idiotic ideas of the likes of Marx and Engels, Marcuse and Reich, Harry Hay and Walter Benjamin, or those of the Frankfurt madmen and Kate Millett? How do human beings fall prey to such awful notions?

“Evil Itself ”

Beyond my own discussions with her, Mallory Millett would go on to relate these sentiments to others, including in a notable February 2018 interview with *FrontPage Magazine*.⁶⁵⁴ Those remembrances are worth quoting not only as further affirmation of what Mallory told me privately but as further (public) extension of what Mallory witnessed. Note her descriptions of Kate’s “evil,” her “darkness,” her raging, ranting, “eyes rolling in her head” and “frothing of the mouth:”

She was the most disturbed, megalomaniacal, evil and dishonest person I have ever known. She tried to kill me so many times that it’s now an enormous blur of traumatizing horrors. She was a sadist, a torturer, a deeply-engrained bully who took immense pleasure in hurting others. Incurable and ruthless, she was expelled multiple times from every school she attended. I spent my childhood with heart hammering as I tiptoed through the house so as not to be noticed by the dreadful Kate. Our mother was helpless, paralyzed with terror in the face of Kate.

It’s a grinding hardship to bring oneself to write such harsh things about one’s own blood. It took some bucking up for me to start telling the truth. ... I spent decades laboring to reason her into the light....

This was especially true after an incident when I was trapped alone with Kate in an apartment in Sacramento for a week and she did not allow me to sleep for five days as she raged and ranted, eyes rolling in her head, frothing at the mouth and holding chats with “little green men.” Not knowing a single person in Sacramento, I had nowhere to turn. Too terrified to go to sleep, I wasn’t sure she even knew who I was but I could imagine a butcher knife thrust into my back as I slept. Big sister Sally came from Nebraska to rescue me.

After that there was an enormous effort by the family wherein we all took Kate to court for legal commitment in Minnesota. She hired a male feminist hotshot New York lawyer and managed to swim back out into the world to hurt, menace, and harm ever more people.

Kate had many handmaidens. Mallory notes that her radical sister had “enablers everywhere” on all seven continents—more groupies, acolytes, minions, who “worshipped” her.

Mallory also recalled in this 2018 interview with *FrontPage Magazine* the “consciousness-raising sessions” in New York City. She underscored that these girls wanted to normalize a host of evils and taboos that even included Satanism and witchcraft:

In 1969 I attended consciousness-raising sessions in New York City with my sister, Kate, where a group of 10-15 women sat around a long oval table and plotted the New Feminist Movement and the founding of NOW. Their template was Mao's China and the group confessionals conducted in each village in order to "cleanse the people's thinking." The burning objective of Kate's "consciousness-raising" was "the destruction of the American family," as she deemed it "a patriarchal institution devoted to the oppression and enslavement of women and children."

They went on to form NOW and, with that organization, achieve their stated goal of taking down the Patriarchy through a massive coordinated promotion of promiscuity, eroticism, prostitution, abortion and homosexuality. Their proposed method was to infiltrate every institution in the nation: the universities, the media, primary and secondary schools, PTAs, Teachers Unions, city and state governments, the library system, the executive branches of government as well as the judiciaries and legislatures.

One of their most desired results was the smashing of every taboo in Western culture. Imagine that! Think of that alone! The normalizing of every taboo: polygamy, bestiality, Satanism, pornography, promiscuity, witchcraft, pedophilia—all activities which rot the human soul and city.

The reaction to this interview posted at the website of *FrontPage Magazine* was quite expressive, with readers not shying from menacing language. When one reader wrote that Kate was not crazy but evil, Mallory herself jumped into the discussion in the readers' comments section and stated emphatically, "I entirely agree with you." Further down in the discussion, Mallory iterated unequivocally that she believes that Kate was demonically possessed: "I have come to understand that Kate was, indeed, possessed and from what I can discern it was probably an early event, most likely before I was born. There was an energy from her that was inexplicable, illogical, demonic and, to any reasonable person, terrifying. She could tear through a room of people like a storm of flying razor blades. A friend who didn't know her once told me she was seated next to Kate (in the 1980's) at a charity dinner and was struck by her demeanor: 'the darkest person I've ever met.....as if she had a black aura.'"

Even if this behavior "was clinically diagnosed as insanity," said Mallory, "for me it was always evil itself."

In sum, Mallory has been on the record for a long time saying these things about Kate. To quote just one more example, back in a June 2014 piece, referring to her larger family, she said that Kate "demonized us."⁶⁵⁵

Practicing the Sexual Politics She Preached

Aside from the dark roots of whatever might have possessed Kate Millett, the fruits of her Marxist ideology were palpably toxic, not just upon the

public but her own life.

Kate practiced the sexual politics she preached. She had long ago abandoned her long-suffering, faithful husband not for men but for numerous other women she hopped in bed with. This included lesbian orgies that slithered into the realm of the pagan. Mallory described to author Carrie Gress a harrowing episode one Halloween evening at Kate's loft apartment. Gress recorded:

Upon entering [Kate's apartment], there was a long, low table with twelve placements topped by a plate, a bowl of water, and sharp knife resting on it. In front of each place setting were twelve completely naked women, sitting cross legged on cushions. The naked woman at the head of the table was wrapped by a ten-foot boa constrictor. Dumbstruck and appalled, Mallory and her friend watched in horror. They were invited to join in the ritual, but they told Kate that they were just there to observe, which seemed to suit Kate since they were only willing to take off their shoes. "As they took their eyes off us to resume their ritual," Mallory explains, "we tiptoed to our shoes and crept out running down those flights like bats out of hell. My feet barely touched the steps until we burst out onto the Bowery, shaking and huffing in shock and terror."⁶⁵⁶

Kate Millett, feminist founder, even tried to aggressively get her own sister, Mallory, in bed with her. What Mallory witnessed among Kate and her cohort was a mix of Marxism, atheism, paganism, witchcraft, the occult, and a flat-out psychotic if not demonic element as well.⁶⁵⁷

Ultimately, Kate's dance with the dark side ended one morning in Paris, September 6, 2017, a week shy of her eighty-third birthday. She collapsed from a massive heart attack.⁶⁵⁸ At her side was her "wife," Sophie Keir.

Mallory got the news from her sister Sally. "I was flooded with such indescribable relief that she could no longer spread her filth, lies and misery, nor could she go on threatening the lives and safety of others," said Mallory. She immediately recalled one such occasion from Kate: "Once, she wrote an entire book describing her deep passion for her lover, Sita. Sita's response was to kill herself. My biggest anxiety about Kate has always been that one day she would take out a family of five on the Saw Mill River Parkway as—laced with liquor, wine, lithium, marijuana, and God knows what else—she hurtled, ranting and raging, up that difficult road. For many years I have braced for that call in the night."

Mallory was relieved. Kate's doting fans, however, mourned; they grieved the passing of their Marxist-feminist heroine.

Kate's funeral was held at a church whose members neither openly embrace Jesus Christ nor the Father—namely, the Fourth Universalist Society, a Unitarian church on Central Park West in New York City. In its glowing obituary, the *New York Times* celebrated not only the late high priestess of women's lib but the “foot soldiers and commanders” of feminism in attendance at Kate's death service: Gloria Steinem, Phyllis Chesler, the actress Kathleen Turner—who was there as “a stand-in for both Hillary Clinton and Robin Morgan”—and even the bizarre Yoko Ono, a buddy of Kate for over fifty years. The congregants at the “church” were led by folk singer and activist Holly Near in bellowing a piece titled “Singing for Our Lives,” which Near wrote after gay pioneer Harvey Milk was murdered. “Everyone seemed to know the words,” wrote the *Times* reporter. “Ms. Ono joined hands with Ms. Keir and Ms. Chesler.”⁶⁵⁹

What a hollow way to go. But it was a fitting dirge to the life of Kate Millett.

The funeral spectacle would have been bad enough if it had reflected merely Kate's perversities. But perhaps saddest of all, Kate's radical sexual politics have become her country's and culture's sexual politics as well, to the point that this author of *Sexual Politics*—this woman—was legally able to marry another woman in the new America, with few batting an eyelash. She pivoted from classical Marxism to cultural Marxism, from economics to sex, from redistributing wealth to stumping for same-sex marriage and “LGBTQ rights.” It took America a few decades, but all the hard work by secular progressives in the schools and the universities eventually brought the masses in line with the very ideas of Kate Millett that Americans once considered insane and evil.

Marx's minions may not have secured an economic revolution, but they have triumphed in their cultural revolution.

PART 6

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER 15

“FUNDAMENTAL TRANSFORMATION”

MARX’S ENDURING SPECTER

“We are five days away from fundamentally transforming the United States of America.” So declared Barack Obama in Columbia, Missouri on October 30, 2008, on the cusp of his historic presidential election. He predicted a “defining moment in history” to “give this country the change we need.”⁶⁶⁰

It was a striking statement, boldly revolutionary, perhaps surpassed only by the response of those in attendance, who, rather than pausing to reflect upon such an audacious assertion, wildly applauded. To be sure, Obama enthusiasts would have ecstatically cheered anything he said at that moment. He could have promised everyone a magical unicorn. Obama himself admitted to serving as a kind of “blank screen” upon which Americans desiring some warm and fuzzy “hope and change” could project whatever they wanted.

But even then, the words “fundamentally transform” should have set off alarm bells. Americans generally don’t do fundamental transformation. They make changes, yes, small and large, but the remarkable system conceived by the American founders—especially remarkable for its stability—was not devised for a single man to enter the White House and initiate a fundamental transformation. Who among us—other than the most

radical revolutionaries—actually want to *fundamentally transform* the nation of Washington and Jefferson and Adams and Madison and Lincoln and the Roosevelts and Kennedy and Reagan? Many people think America has many problems, but those can be addressed without a *fundamental transformation*. Ask professors who teach history or political ideologies and they will tell you that totalitarian communism, Marxism-Leninism, is the ideology that seeks fundamental transformation.

Recall that in *The German Ideology* (among others), Marx and Engels said that in order to achieve “communist consciousness, and for the success of the cause, it is necessary that man himself should suffer a massive change.” This change must come through “a revolution,” a process of “overthrowing” the old “filthy yoke and ... founding a new society only in a revolution.” Marx repeatedly urged nothing less than the creation of a “new world.” His “generation,” he insisted, like the Jews that Moses led out of the wilderness, must “conquer a new world” and “must also perish in order to make room for the people who are fit for a new world.”⁶⁶¹ Communists would play the role of sacrificial savior to deliver a new secular covenant for the new world.

Such is the totalitarian task of communism. Indeed, the textbook definition of totalitarianism, which I have scribbled on the chalkboard every fall semester at Grove City College since 1997, is to fundamentally transform—specifically, to seek to fundamentally transform human nature via some form of political-ideological-cultural upheaval.

So, that being the case, I winced when Barack Obama said that, and then felt sick to the stomach when I watched people blissfully and blindly applaud. Such blithe *unthought* is disturbing to see from inhabitants of a nation founded upon the extraordinarily thoughtful and stable principles of 1776.

And yet, Obama’s two-term presidency no doubt marked a turning point. The country did seem to begin a fundamental transformation in that period and through the 2010s.⁶⁶²

That fundamental transformation, however, did not happen in areas hoped for (or feared) in 2008, or that Obama perhaps even had in mind let alone dared to mention in Columbia, Missouri. It has not been a fundamental shift in attitudes regarding the role of government, taxation,

regulations, economics, class, or even healthcare, where Obama had his signature legislative achievement. It did not happen in foreign policy.

The reality is that the true fundamental transformation in America (and the West generally) has come in the realm of culture, notably in matters of sexual orientation, gender, marriage, and family. The shift there has been unprecedented and far beyond anyone's imagination in 2008. It was signaled most conspicuously in June 2015 when the Obama White House—the nation's first house—was illuminated in the colors of the “LGBTQ” rainbow on the day of the *Obergefell* decision, when the Supreme Court, by a one-vote margin, rendered unto itself the ability to redefine marriage (theretofore the province of biblical and natural law) and imposed this new “Constitutional right” on all fifty states. If ever there was a picture of a fundamental transformation, that was it. And that was just one of countless “accomplishments” heralded and boasted of by the Obama administration. In June 2016, to celebrate the one-year anniversary of *Obergefell*, the White House press office released two extraordinary fact sheets detailing President Obama's vast efforts to promote “LGBT” rights at home and abroad.⁶⁶³ Not only was it telling that the White House would assemble such a list, and tout it, but the sheer length of the list was stunning to behold. There was no similar list of such dramatic changes by the Obama White House in any other policy area. Such achievements included the infamous Obama bathroom fiat, through which, according to Barack Obama's executive word, all public schools were ordered to revolutionize their restrooms and locker rooms to make them available to teenage boys who want to be called girls.

Looking back, it is in the understanding of human sexuality, its subversion really, that Barack Obama left his stamp upon the United States. One can hope the stamp is not indelible.

From there, the culture's fundamental transformation has hit warp speed, with the number of optional “gender identities,” for instance, expanding exponentially. Changes there, more than anywhere, seem irreversible by anything other than the miraculous, by anything short of a religious revival or unforeseeable dramatic shift in spiritual-moral thinking.

As noted, the New York City council offers public employees the option of choosing from thirty-one different “gender identities,” including pioneering gay communist Harry Hay's “two-spirit” option. Of course, that is nothing compared to Facebook, which at various times since 2014 has

listed fifty-one gender options, fifty-three, fifty-six, fifty-eight, and seventy-one, or to the BBC, which (as of 2019) teaches children that there are more than one hundred and counting.⁶⁶⁴

Where does it end? Truly no one knows.

The political left's cultural revolution on the sexual-gender-family front is ubiquitous, as is its intolerance of any dissenters. We see it in the culture of fear and intimidation by the self-prided forces of "diversity" and "tolerance" who viciously seek to denounce, dehumanize, demonize, and destroy anyone who disagrees with their brazen newfound conceptions of marriage and family, even as their inventions are at odds with the prevailing position of 99.99 percent-plus of human beings who have bestrode the earth since the dawn of humanity. Instead, traditional Christians are the ones portrayed as the outliers, as abnormal, as extremists, as bigots, as "haters."

That is a fundamental transformation of a culture and a nation. That is evidence of a true revolution by the heirs of Marx and other radicals.

"The Most Radical Rupture in Traditional Relations"

To "fundamentally transform." Here was, in essence, an inherently Marxist goal declared to a sea of oblivious Americans, whether Barack Obama explicitly or fully understood or meant it himself. It is highly doubtful that Obama had Marx (or a Marcuse or Millett or Reich) on the mind at that moment.⁶⁶⁵ Obama was merely riding a wave that began as a ripple over a century or so ago. And typically, most of those surfing or floating along have little notion who or what helped give the initial push.

Nonetheless, the goal of Karl Marx and the Marxist project from the outset was one of fundamental transformation, permanent revolution, and unrestrained criticism of everything—nothing less than "the ruthless criticism of all that exists."⁶⁶⁶ Marx's ideas were so radical, and so (as Marx openly conceded) "contrary to the nature of things," that they inevitably lead to totalitarianism; that is because they *are* totalitarian in the strictest sense, as they seek to transform human nature and the foundational order. We have seen passages from Marx to that effect throughout this book. Here is a short summary:

- Marx in the *Manifesto* said that communism represents "the most radical rupture in traditional relations."

- Marx in the *Manifesto* acknowledged that communism seeks to “abolish the present state of things.”
- Marx in the *Manifesto* stated that “they [the Communists] openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.”
- Marx in the close of the *Manifesto*: “Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.”
- Marx in a letter to Arnold Ruge called for the “ruthless criticism of all that exists.”
- Marx had a favorite quote from Goethe’s *Faust*, “Everything that exists deserves to perish.”
- Marx in his essay declaring religion “the opium of the people” said that “the criticism of religion is the beginning of all criticism.” (Recall that in that essay he used the word “criticism” twenty-nine times.)

Beyond ruthless criticism, there was ruthless abolition. The word “abolition” is omnipresent throughout Marx’s writings. As Robert Payne noted, the word almost seems to jump off every page of the *Manifesto*.⁶⁶⁷ “And after he has ‘abolished’ property, family, and nations, and all existing societies, Marx shows little interest in creating a new society on the ruins of the old,” observed Payne. “He had written in a poem to Jenny that he would throw a gauntlet at the world, and watch it crumble. Comforted by her love, he would wander through the kingdom of ruins, his words glowing with action, his heart like the heart of God. The *Communist Manifesto* was the gauntlet he threw at the world.”⁶⁶⁸

It was indeed. Marx’s more benign modern defenders want to characterize Lenin and Stalin and other tyrants as aberrations of Marxism, as the nasty totalitarians seeking to annihilate the old order. In fact, they were merely following Marx, the ultimate revolutionary and rebel. Karl Marx wanted to burn down the house long before Lenin and Stalin were even born.

Lenin himself would profess the same, as is likewise clear throughout his statements. As merely one case in point, consider again his seminal 1920 speech to the Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young

Communist League, published in *Pravda* in October 1920. That speech was quoted in this book at length for its many striking statements against religion. Equally significant, however, was Lenin's expressed task to immediately set about abolishing and fundamentally transforming the old order. "Comrades, today I would like to talk on the fundamental tasks of the Young Communist League," Lenin began to the six hundred delegates at the October 1920 Congress. "It is the youth that will be faced with the actual task of creating a communist society. For it is clear that the generation of working people brought up in capitalist society can, at best, accomplish the task of destroying the foundations of the old."⁶⁶⁹

Vladimir Lenin—communist, Bolshevik, self-anointed keeper of the Marxist flame, half namesake of Marxism-Leninism—could not have been clearer: the "task" was to destroy the foundations of the old.

The "whole point here," said Lenin, was "the transformation of the old, capitalist society; the upbringing, training and education of the new generations that will create the communist society cannot be conducted on the old lines." The teaching, training, and education of youth "must" be directed to that goal: "Only by radically remolding the teaching, organization and training of the youth shall we be able to ensure that the efforts of the younger generation will result in the creation of a society that will be unlike the old society, i.e., in the creation of a communist society."

Note the unmistakable language from Lenin: "destroying the foundations of the old," "the transformation of the old," "radically remolding."

Here, Lenin pointed back to Marx, as he always did, as the "genius" inspiration. "He was a genius," Lenin told his beaming young comrades, particularly because of Marx's goal of radically and critically reshaping everything. "He [Marx] critically reshaped everything that had been created by human society, without ignoring a single detail," said Lenin, speaking of Marx here in almost omnipotent terms. "He reconsidered, subjected to criticism, and verified on the working-class movement everything that human thinking had created."

No doubt that was true of the man who called for the ruthless criticism of everything that exists. He and Lenin were of the same mind.

The old schools were so loathsome, averred Lenin: "The old schools produced servants needed by the capitalists. We must therefore abolish

them.” The new “aim,” said Lenin, was simple: “learn communism.” He told the youth: “You have to build up a communist society. ... You must be foremost among the millions of builders of a communist society in whose ranks every young man and woman should be.” Every young man and woman should proceed in that total task at hand. No exceptions. “You must train yourselves to be communists,” demanded Lenin. “To be a communist means that you must organize and unite the entire young generation.” As for “the old society,” said Lenin, “We had to destroy all that, and overthrow them.” This meant “overthrowing the tsar, overthrowing the capitalists, and abolishing the capitalist class.”

Thus, communism would become the central guiding principle and force in the lives of youth. “This generation should know that the entire purpose of their lives is to build a communist society,” insisted Lenin. “The members of the [Young Communist] League should use every spare hour to improve the vegetable gardens, or to organize the education of young people at some factory, and so on.”

Such was the mission field, a literal field, or a factory floor. That was mission territory for the disciples to sow the harvest. Communism was the alpha and the omega. It was truly like a religious calling, a new order.

It was to be a fundamental transformation.

The March Through the Institutions

This call to total transformation resonates today among cultural and sexual Marxists. While very different from classical Marxists in their cultural-sexual as opposed to economic thinking, they bear a crucial commonality with their forebears in this ongoing objective of fundamental transformation via criticizing all that exists, especially traditional Judeo-Christian values and institutions. The original ambition of an economic/class-based revolution has failed. And so, instead, today’s Marxists—including throughout Communist Party USA, once the home of classical Marxism—have gone cultural and sexual.

This newly evolved form of Marxism is so radical in its redefinition of human nature that Karl Marx himself would blush and find it bewildering. When I first drafted this chapter, the lead article at CPUSA’s website was titled “The Capitalist Culture of Male Supremacy and Misogyny”—a piece breathtaking in its cultural radicalism.⁶⁷⁰ It personifies the communist

movement's thrust today. Truly, at any given day, an article like that can be found at the CPUSA website or at its flagship publication, *People's World*. That is where modern Marxists in America now stand.

As noted, this cultural Marxism began to emerge not on May 5, 1818, with Marx's birth, but over a hundred years later with the birth of what came to be known as the Frankfurt School.

As shown, these 1920s and 1930s German Marxists were Freudian-Marxists for whom orthodox/classical Marxism was too limited. They and their disciples, especially in America and the wider West in the 1960s, lusted for revolutionary changes in sexuality and in culture. The universities would be their factory floor. They would rally students, the academy, the arts, the media, film—the forces of cultural change.

Even then, one can look at the Frankfurt School's cultural Marxism not as a replacement for classical Marxism but as the accelerator pedal for a wheezing, stalling vehicle. The cultural Marxist fully agrees with the classical Marxist that history passes through a series of stages on the way to the final Marxist utopia, through feudalism and capitalism and socialism and ultimately to the classless society. But the cultural Marxist recognizes that communists will not get there by economics alone. In essence, cultural Marxists shrewdly realized that the classical Marxists would utterly fail to take down the West with an economic revolution; capitalism would always blow away communism; the masses would choose free markets. Cultural Marxists understand that the revolution requires a cultural war over an economic war. Whereas the West—certainly America—is not vulnerable to a revolt of the downtrodden trade-union masses, it is eminently vulnerable when it comes to, say, sex or porn. Whereas a revolution for wealth redistribution has been unappealing to most citizens of the West, a sexual revolution would be irresistible. Put the bourgeoisie in front of a hypnotic or seductive screen, and it would be putty in your hands.

In this book, we have looked at key figures of the Frankfurt School, including Georg Lukacs, Walter Benjamin, *The Sexual Revolution's* Wilhelm Reich, and (among others) Herbert Marcuse, whose bizarre meanderings swept up the sixties New Left, making Marcuse an ideological guru to the radicals who today are tenured at our universities.

Not to be forgotten on the cultural front, however, is a critical figure, a non-German. At the age of thirty-five, in 1926, Antonio Gramsci was arrested in his native Italy by Mussolini and spent the last eleven years of

his life in prison, where he would write, write, and write—compiling a master volume of thirty-three *Prison Notebooks*.⁶⁷¹ Samuel Gregg calls Gramsci perhaps “the most dangerous socialist in history.”⁶⁷²

Gramsci, too, looked to culture. If the fundamental transformers of the radical left truly wanted to win, then they needed to first seize the so-called “cultural means of production;” that is, culture-forming institutions such as the media and universities and even churches. Gramsci himself foresaw societal transformation coming about by what others have characterized as a Gramscian “long march through the institutions.”⁶⁷³ That is, the institutions of the culture.⁶⁷⁴

Not until leftists came to dominate these institutions would they be able to convince enough people to support their Marxist revolution. “This part of his thesis was like manna from heaven for many left-wing Western intellectuals,” writes Gregg of Gramsci. “Instead of joining a factory collective or making bombs in basements, a leftist professor could help free society from capitalist exploitation by penning essays in his office or teaching students.”

The heirs of Gramsci, like the ideological progeny of Marx and Lenin and the Frankfurt School, insisted on the need to question everything, including moral absolutes and the Judeo-Christian basis of Western civilization. They needed to frame seemingly benign conventions as systematic injustices that must be exposed. This is where we got professors fulminating against everything from “the patriarchy” to “white imperialism” to “transphobia.” By the twenty-first century, even biological sex was no longer considered a settled issue.

There was no traditional institution off limits to the cultural left.

In fact, so “critical” was the cultural-Marxist Left of everything, it would brand itself as “critical theory.” Today, there are entire academic departments and programs dedicated to “critical theory” and offshoots such as “queer theory” and “gender ideology.” Barack Obama’s alma mater, Occidental College, is hardly an anomaly in boasting a Department of Critical Theory and Social Justice, which at its website promises to instruct wide-eyed students in the principles of “Marxism, psychoanalysis, the Frankfurt School, deconstruction, critical race studies, queer theory, feminist theory, postcolonial theory.”

For the cultural-Marxist left, “critical theory” is the *zeitgeist*, the prevailing spirit of the age. Michael Walsh dubs it “the cult of critical theory,” the playground of “The Devil’s Pleasure Palace,” the instrument for what he rightly calls “the subversion of the West.” To quote the sixties radicals, *hey, hey, ho, ho, Western civ has got to go.*⁶⁷⁵

Perhaps most frustrating to those standing aghast at this destruction is that the typical Starbucks-sipper redefining marriage and gender has no clue that she may be complicit in a vast cultural Marxist revolution.

Sam Gregg puts it well: “The worst part of Gramsci’s legacy is that it has effectively transcended its Marxist origins. His outlook is now blankly taken for granted by millions of teachers, writers, even churchmen, who have no idea that they are committed to cultural Marxism.”

That is so agonizingly true. And so, adds Gregg, “the vast structures of cynicism which Gramsci’s ideas have built, which honeycomb Western society today, will prove much tougher to dismantle than the crude cement blocks of the old Berlin Wall.”

They will indeed. The people of Berlin had no problem recognizing the concrete wrongness of the wall that corralled them. But try telling same-sex marriage supporters that what they support is concretely wrong, or that it somehow might have evolved from certain Marxist origins. They will either give you a blank stare or laugh in your face.

The Never-Ending Search for the Newest Victim Class

In a crucial respect, classical Marxism and cultural Marxism will always bear an essential, enduring commonality—one that explains a lot about today’s modern left.

Both classical Marxists and cultural Marxists see history as a series of struggles that divide the world into hostile/antagonistic groups of oppressors and the oppressed. Both seek out victim groups as the anointed group that will also serve as society’s redeemer group.⁶⁷⁶ The victim group becomes the agent for emancipation in ushering in the new and better world. The Marxist must always, then, be on the search for the newest victim class which, in turn, must always be made aware of its victimization. Its “consciousness” must be raised.

In classical Marxism, this was simple: the victim group was identified by class/economics. It was the proletariat. It was the factory worker.

In cultural Marxism, this has not been so simple, because the culture is always changing: the victim group is constantly being searched for anew by the cultural Marxist. The group one year might be women, the next year African Americans, the next year another group. Today, there's a hard push by cultural Marxists to tap the "LGBTQIA-plus" (*People's World* frequently uses that expansive label) movement as the championed victim group: lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transgenders, "queer" persons, "intersexuals," "asexuals," and on and on.

Thus, a leading cultural Marxist like Angela Davis (mentored by Herbert Marcuse) could stand at the January 2017 Women's March in Washington, DC before a sea of oblivious girls wearing pink hats modeled after their genitalia and recite a litany of politically correct grievances. In her casting about for victim groups, the former Communist Bloc cheerleader hailed the transgendered Chelsea Manning, "trans women of color," "our flora and fauna," and "intersectional feminism," and denounced "white male hetero-patriarchy," misogyny, Islamophobia, and capitalist exploitation.⁶⁷⁷

Victims, victims, victims.

Davis, who twice ran on Communist Party USA's presidential ticket, and in 1979 was awarded the Lenin Peace Prize by the Kremlin in Moscow, did not mention CPUSA but LGBTQ, not Marx but Manning, not Bolshevism but transgenderism. She spoke not about class but culture. She knew she would find allies not in railing against property rights but in ranting for "marriage rights."

That is the tack throughout the modern communist movement.

It is very revealing that the "About" section of the website of *People's World*, successor to the Soviet-funded *Daily Worker* and the leading mouthpiece of American communism, singles out a label that would have had Marx and Engels scratching their heads: "cultural workers." It states, "Today, *People's World* offers a daily news platform for the broad labor-led people's movement—a voice for workers, the unemployed, people of color, immigrants, women, youth, seniors, LGBTQ people, cultural workers, students and people with disabilities."⁶⁷⁸

They are looking less for *factory workers* than *cultural workers*. Forget the factory floor—that project failed long ago. Communists tried to organize the steelworkers, the autoworkers, the teamsters, the coal miners.

It didn't work. (West Virginia coalminers in 2016 voted for Donald Trump.) The new recruiting ground is the classroom floor, the campus, the university, the schools. That is where the cultural workers who can usher in the fundamental transformation are being sought and being found. These modern cultural revolutionaries are succeeding magnificently in redefining everything from marriage and family to sexuality and gender.

This is where today's Marxists in America and the West are toiling hard. They are working diligently on the cultural front. That is where they are confident that they can finally take down the West and its Judeo-Christian bedrock that Marx and a long line of disciples looked to smash.

Critical Theory and Critical Marx—or the Devil Is in the Details

Clearly then, perhaps the most important link between cultural Marxism and the classical Marxism of Marx, of Lenin, and of Marx's immediate implementors and longtime admirers is found in the very name that cultural Marxism has assumed in the academy. In a way, it is maddeningly frustrating—seemingly almost willfully deceptive, one suspects—that the academy has chosen or clung to the term “critical theory” to covertly fly the banner of cultural Marxism; such is a more palatable label to shop its wares, to market its ideological snake-oil. Knowing they would get flagged openly advertising an academic program titled Cultural Marxism, no doubt alarming college alumni and trustees alike, shrewd academic leftists instead went with the more innocuous and ambiguous Critical Theory. And yet, that said, “*critical* theory” perfectly describes what cultural Marxists do best: they criticize.

By seeking to tear down the old, especially the traditions they detest, they are acting in the mold and spirit of Karl Marx, and of Lenin. They may not be able to tell you a century or mere decade henceforth what will be erected in its place, but they do agree on the need to bulldoze the house. Give them not a screwdriver but a sledgehammer.

And yet, like neo-Marxist pioneer Herbert Marcuse with his notion of “repressive tolerance” (he urged “intolerance against movements from the Right, and toleration of movements from the Left”), they only blast to smithereens the things they don't like. They are willing to tolerate all sorts of novel inventions, from new forms of “marriage” and sexuality to endless

gender options. They actually *don't* criticize quite everything, but instead only the things they don't like. Like liberals and progressives who beam about "diversity" and "tolerance," critical theorists and cultural Marxists vilify only those who depart from their newfangled vision for the world and humanity. If you agree with their fundamental transformation, then you are good and accepted. If you disagree, then prepare to be boycotted, turned into a pariah on social media, lynched by Twitter mobs, pursued by lawyers and dragged into court. *You* are not to be included under the rainbow umbrella of "diversity," which, it turns out, is not as multi-colored as they had led the world to believe. This is their great tolerance-diversity fraud. Sadly, 90 percent of them in their *zeitgeist* (maybe *vortex* would be a better word) often do not even realize the phoniness. Such has been their university brainwashing that they do not seem to have the mental wherewithal to discern these contradictions. One is tempted to call it a hoax, but that would suggest they are aware of it.

Welcome to the maddening tyranny of moral relativism that is the common feeding trough of the left en masse, whether a progressive, a "liberal," a critical theorist, a cultural Marxist. And alas, that is the toxic cup from which they imbibe, the chalice that unites them in their fundamental transformation of the Judeo-Christian West.

The Modernist Heresy

This fundamental transformation is a byproduct of the new modern spirit. The forces of modernism have sought nothing less.

"Modernism aims at that radical transformation of human thought in relation to God, man, the world, and life, here and hereafter," states the *Catholic Encyclopedia*.⁶⁷⁹ It is a threat that the Church did not notice just today. To the contrary, these modernist forces caught the Church's attention early in the previous century, as Marxism was taking flight and in some countries taking hold.

One man who saw it coming, or something like it, was Pope Pius X, whose encyclical on the Modernists, formally known as *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, was published in 1907. It called modernism the "synthesis of all heresies." Modernism had to be condemned in order to protect the faith, including from enemies not only outside but inside the gates. These modernists were not merely Marxists or communists or socialists but a

wider panoply of leftists, pagans, progressives, moral relativists, cultural relativists, human-nature redefiners, fundamental transformers. Their enemies were absolutes, religion, tradition. They believe in change, reform, evolution, progression—that is, “progress.” They favored then and favor still not an *enduring moral order* (Russell Kirk’s description of conservatism) but an *ever-evolving order*. They reject the very notion of an unchanging moral order based on biblical and natural law. They believe that truths and values can and do evolve, change, *progress* along with or relative to society, culture, norms, history. They reject that there is such a thing as “abiding truths,” a “storehouse of wisdom” to preserve and conserve, or what G. K. Chesterton called a “democracy of the dead” always worth considering and consulting.⁶⁸⁰

Pius X warned of the “many roads” of Modernism that lead “to atheism and to the annihilation of all religion.” We face a terrific danger as each and every person renders unto itself his or her own individual interpretation of truth and reality. Eventually, each person becomes his or her own god. Soon enough, it ends in Karl Marx’s ultimate goal: the undermining if not annihilation of religion.

The Anonymous Power

Such being the case, then who or what is today’s Western world ultimately following? Who or what is whispering in our ears? Who or what is silently prodding the culture? Is it the same murky force to which Karl Marx penned his sordid prose?

Perhaps a trenchant insight into all of this is a phrase coined by Joseph Ratzinger, who would become Pope Benedict XVI: “the anonymous power.” It seems a poignant portent of where we are culturally, socially, ideologically, theologically, at this troubling juncture in history.

Today, as in every era, though at a pace unseen before, we see and suffer through many dangerous fads and fashions, especially since the nineteenth century. Whether we are dealing with silly, destructive, *old* ideas like Marxism, Freudianism, or even the ugly Freudian-Marxism of the Frankfurt School, or dealing with silly, destructive, *new* ideas like transgenderism, gender ideology, the ever-expanding “LGBTQ” movement (again, already morphing into what many label “LGBTQIA+”), “intersectionality,” critical

theory, queer theory, or whatever the latest trend, these often-toxic ideas—old or new—share a few notable commonalities:

First, there is the sheer sophistry of these *concepts* (in as much as they deserve to be called “concepts”) and their inherent violation of common sense. Worse, the sophistry is so self-evident, particularly to anyone schooled in a Christian/Catholic worldview with a well-formed conscience, moral compass, and intellectual tradition. Second, there is the matter of the sheer harmfulness of these ideas in and beyond their time; the cultural carnage, the human wreckage, the soul damage. Third, there is their fleeting quality, their ephemeral nature, which is never clear to enough people, as so many get sucked into the vortex. Amid the prevalence and dominance of these pernicious doctrines, countless human beings get swept up. Fourth, and maybe most frustrating, is the reality that many of these concepts have a strange tendency to simply slither into the night and vanish. But even as they might seem to mercifully disappear into the dustbin of history, they often have a tendency to hang on, linger, reemerge in a slightly altered form, and to continue to corrode. For instance, we thought that the very recent victory of the West in the Cold War had killed communism. Quite the contrary, the ideology has bounced back with a shocking appeal among a very high number of Millennials.⁶⁸¹

From whom or what do these concepts draw their power?

Joseph Ratzinger spoke of what he called the “anonymous power” that dictates prevailing fads and fashions. He related the phrase to a much earlier but defining time in history, a decidedly theological and Christological moment: Judas’s betrayal of Jesus. “Judas is neither a master of evil nor the figure of a demoniacal power of darkness but rather a sycophant who bows down before the anonymous power of changing moods and current fashion,” Benedict stated. “But it is precisely this anonymous power that crucified Jesus, for it was anonymous voices that cried, ‘Away with him! Crucify him!’”

By this rendering, Judas was a mere sycophant to what Benedict dubbed “the anonymous power” of “changing moods and current fashion.” This highly influential power lives on in modern times, of course. It never seems to go away. It is a power that one cannot always get a handle on, or visibly discern, but it is there, with its terrible effects, looming large and holding tremendous sway over the crowd.

It was indeed that same anonymous power, manifest in the form of anonymous voices, which yelled at Jesus, “Away with him! Crucify him.” We know not their faces. But we know they handed Christ over.

Mere days earlier, the same people had been hailing Christ with hosannas, begging him to heal them, watching his miracles in awe, welcoming him into their homes and towns. And just like that, they turned on him.

There have been so many ideas and ideologies in which we have discerned such anonymous power at work: Marxism, Freudianism, Freudian-Marxism, the twisted notions of a Wilhelm Reich, a Walter Benjamin, a Herbert Marcuse, a Mikhail Bakunin, a Bruno Bauer, an Aleister Crowley, a Harry Hay, a Kate Millett, those which inspired the diabolical brutality in places like Pitesti prison in Romania or 60 Andrassy Street in Hungary. Consider the martyrs and suffering witnesses such as the Rev. Richard Wurmbrand or Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty, tortured in the name of a vapid ideology of class warfare. Then consider the militant push by secular progressives throughout the West to redefine God’s plan for marriage and family and gender. The same spirit is there, almost in the ether, the air we breathe. It is a spirit which has the force of a veritable cultural tsunami. On TV and Twitter and Facebook and the web, it is overwhelming.

Our Western world is comprised of legions of sycophants to the anonymous power of changing moods and current fashion. Whatever the latest fads, no matter how contrary to the moral law and natural law, from redefining marriage to even redefining one’s Godgiven and nature-given gender, modernist democratic majorities step forth to ride the wave and board the latest bandwagon.

It is what some call the *zeitgeist* (a German term, fittingly), the prevailing spirit—a phrase that Ratzinger, as a German, would know. R. Emmett Tyrrell Jr., founding editor of *The American Spectator*, refers to this as the *Kultursmog* (“culture smog,” another German term, fittingly). Benedict attributed slightly more contour to this spirit or smog, calling it an “anonymous power” that seems to almost have form and presence, and is perhaps inspired by a darker force altogether. And it indeed is felt everywhere in every age, albeit cleverly assuming an always-altering manifestation.

Who or what is driving it? Well, no one can really say, or see. Who is the leader, the face? Nobody. If there is any driving “philosophy” that rules the modern world, it is the dictatorship of relativism, in which everyone is his or her own guiding power. Such is another apt phrase of Benedict that goes hand in hand here.

In his final homily after the death of John Paul II, given just before the College of Cardinals convened to choose him as the next pope, Cardinal Ratzinger called out a “dictatorship of relativism.”⁶⁸² What prompted his words were the readings that day, April 18, 2005. He was quoting Ephesians 4:14, where St. Paul warned of people being “tossed here and there, carried about by every wind of doctrine” (Eph 4:14).

As Ratzinger noted with exclamation, “This description is very timely!” He explained:

How many winds of doctrine have we known in recent decades, how many ideological currents, how many ways of thinking. The small boat of the thought of many Christians has often been tossed about by these waves—flung from one extreme to another: from Marxism to liberalism, even to libertinism; from collectivism to radical individualism; from atheism to a vague religious mysticism; from agnosticism to syncretism and so forth. Every day new sects spring up, and what St. Paul says about human deception and the trickery that strives to entice people into error (cf. Ephesians 4:14) comes true.

Today, having a clear faith based on the Creed of the Church is often labeled as fundamentalism. Whereas relativism, that is, letting oneself be “tossed here and there, carried about by every wind of doctrine,” seems the only attitude that can cope with modern times. We are building a dictatorship of relativism that does not recognize anything as definitive and whose ultimate goal consists solely of one’s own ego and desires.

This captures powerfully the phenomenon to which I have struggled to affix a label. In fingering the various extremes, Ratzinger fittingly named Marxism first, with a litany of other variants of Modernism following. Yes, every day it seems a new sect pops up, with people so easily deceived, tricked, enticed. Whoever is behind the dramatic success of that moral relativism which lies at the root of Modernism (and Marxism) is who or what has succeeded in nearly destroying western civilization. No doubt, the devil to whom, as we have seen, Karl Marx gave such chilling attention has had a hand in it all.

Communism became an ideology of deception and of infiltration, manipulation, exploitation—trickery, dupery. Just ask the likes of Ben Gitlow, Louis Budenz, Manning Johnson, Bella Dodd. Maybe even ask William Z. Foster, Earl Browder, Harry Ward—assuming they would ever

admit to enticing people into error. Or ask those who foresaw it and warned of it: Popes Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius X, Pius XI, Pius XII, John Paul II.

So many victims would succumb, tossed here and there, carried about by every wind of doctrine.

On the positive side, Ratzinger recommended how to avoid this pitfall, and the answer is one that has remained true for two thousand years:

We, however, have a different goal: the Son of God, the true man. He is the measure of true humanism. An “adult” faith is not a faith that follows the trends of fashion and the latest novelty; a mature adult faith is deeply rooted in friendship with Christ. It is this friendship that opens us up to all that is good and gives us a criterion by which to distinguish the true from the false, and deceit from truth....

The other element of the Gospel to which I wanted to refer is Jesus’ teaching on bearing fruit: “It was I who chose you to go forth and bear fruit. Your fruit must endure” (John 15: 16).

Ratzinger repeated that exhortation, especially for his fellow priests: “We have received the faith to give it to others—we are priests in order to serve others. And we must bear fruit that will endure.”

It is Christ’s faith that endures. It is Christ’s Church that endures. Ratzinger would have agreed with G. K. Chesterton, who said, “The Catholic Church is the one thing that saves a man from the degrading slavery of being a child of his age.”

A child of his age, captive to the currents of the dictatorship of relativism and the dictates of the anonymous power. That describes the West today. Amid the winds of all these foolish philosophies that have come and gone, and are still coming and going, even if we do not realize it, the Church truly is the one thing that saves a man from the degrading slavery of the futile doctrines that toss him about like an infant.

“All people desire to leave a lasting mark,” stated Ratzinger in that April 2005 homily. “But what endures? Money does not. Even buildings do not, nor books. After a certain time, longer or shorter, all these things disappear. The only thing that lasts forever is the human soul, the human person created by God for eternity.”

Spirit of Truth vs. Spirit of the Age and Marx

“If you marry the mood or the spirit of the age,” warned Fulton Sheen, “then you will be a widow in the next one. These fashions simply do not last.”⁶⁸³

Sheen affirmed that “we’ve got to have some principles that do not change to live by.” In order “to think well, one has to have principles that are independent of space and time. By which one can live. We know that these principles exist, and we know there’s such a thing as truth simply because there’s a *logos*, there’s an intelligence behind the universe.”

Those are the abiding truths, the first things, the permanent things, the enduring moral order. Individuals do not invent these anew. They are there. And it is the sacred duty of the Church, with its deposit of the true faith, to protect and cultivate, to maintain and proclaim them.

It is the Church, Sheen ardently argued, that keeps a man and a woman on the straight and right path: “Why is a romance very much, like Chesterton says, like driving a chariot, six wild horses, driving them down a mountain lane, road? And on either side of this mountain road, there’s a ravine here, precipice here, chasm here and a pit here. And the thrill of following truth is to drive those horses straight down that line.” Sheen set that image and model against the ideologies and isms of his day:

Oh, it’s the easiest thing in all the world to be a rightist, for example, in politics. All you gotta do is tumble over. The easiest thing in the world to be a leftist. Just fall over. Let go. It’s the easiest thing in the world to be an Arian in the fourth, fifth century. Easiest thing in the world to tumble into some mood today. Very easy to be a communist. Just as simple as falling off a log. Very easy to be a Nazi, all you gotta do is fall into the other side. So, the great romance of truth therefore consists in going to this straight line, knowing the pitfalls, driving the horses of truth directly, and seeing all of these errors and moods, prostrate and fallen and forgotten. But driving ahead, reeling but erect, that’s the romance of thinking, that’s the joy of truth.

The truth was to be found in Truth itself, in Himself. And Sheen was certain most of all that Truth existed in the Church that He, Jesus Christ, founded upon Peter, the rock upon which He built His Church. That Church would provide the foundation for surviving age after age and all the corrosive ideologies and isms and spirits that pervade it. The Church offers a constant reminder to people of the principles that do not change and which thus are those to live by, and those which will protect us from being children of our age.⁶⁸⁴

No wonder Karl Marx and his minions hated religion. It halts their essential project to fundamentally transform.

Sheen said that the Church is a rock, stable and sure: “The ideas of the Church are like her vestments; always well-dressed but never the slave of passing fashion.” He said, “The Church knows after 1900 years’ experience

that any institution which suits the spirit of the age will be a widow in the next one.”⁶⁸⁵ Sheen averred that the main problem with modern systems is that they are steered by the spirit of the age and the evolution of the world.⁶⁸⁶ They fill the air with noxious ideas toxic to the soul. They infuse the atmosphere with particulates of whatever anonymous power will choke the lungs and cloud the mind.

In the case of atheistic communism, those have been no ordinary pollutants. A legacy of over one hundred million dead, not to mention the robbing of so many basic liberties and the incalculable harm to so many souls has been nothing short of diabolical—truly a satanic scourge, a killing machine. The effects of that dance of death have been pernicious. Its specter endures. It is one of the worst modernist heresies and fruitless works of darkness. It plagues us to this day.

To borrow from Marx, hellish vapors still rise up around us. To what extent do those vapors emanate from the Prince of Darkness who sold that blood-dark sword about which Marx, as a young man, waxed poetic? The one that unerringly stabbed within the soul that went mad until the heart was utterly changed and the soul forfeited heaven by choosing hell.

Hellish vapors indeed. Marx saw something there.

If Karl Marx might have erred his way into one insight of value for understanding this damnable mess, maybe that was it. Our duty must be to struggle against those hellish vapors, to not breathe them in. We must battle against and expose the powers of darkness that continue to pervade this modern world.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is a product of many years of sordid knowledge that I have unfortunately accumulated through the lamentable occupational hazard of studying, writing about, and teaching Marxism and the history of communism. I would much rather write about something happier like, oh, baseball. But alas, this is my lot in life. And I am grateful to several student assistants who suffered with me through the (unenviable) unique research for this particular book and its particularly awful subject matter.

Among my Grove City College students, I want to pay special thanks to Hannah Lutz, Ian Worrell, Erin McLaughlin, and Zach and Jennifer (whose last names I've left out because they have sensitive positions). Among these students, many had to wade through the same ideological-mental manure that I did. Ian dealt with Aleister Crowley and Walter Benjamin and their impenetrably stupid and outright wicked concepts. My deepest apologies to Hannah and Jennifer, who stumbled into the sick, gross material on Crowley and Walter Duranty. My apologies, too, to their parents. Such are the unexpected pitfalls of researching these perverse people. One can scarcely imagine the levels of depravity one might encounter. Leave it to Marxists to break the mold every time. It is never pretty. Also, Jennifer and Hannah highlighted and read more biographies of Karl Marx and his family than any well-adjusted human being should ever have to endure in a lifetime.

I would like to thank Doug Grane for his timely advice that I not ignore Pope Pius X's warnings of the "Modernist heresy" in his brilliant *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*. I saw Doug at a talk that I was giving at the Union League Club in Chicago in March 2019. He's an old grad-school classmate of mine from the School of International Service at The American University in

Washington, DC. I hadn't seen him in over twenty-five years. Doug suggested a full book on the Modernist heresy, which indeed someone ought to pursue at this time of full-blown Modernist heresy in the West. Few warnings have proved as prophetic as that of Pius X over a century ago. I wanted to ensure that *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* at least got its due in this book. At that same talk in Chicago, another old friend, Jameson Campaigne, suggested that I do a full edited volume on the Church's encyclicals on communism and socialism. That, too, was beyond the scope of my plans, but it was a good reminder that I not neglect at least a cursory summary of some of those encyclicals in this book.

Special gratitude, of course, goes to the good folks at TAN Books and Saint Benedict Press: John Moorehouse made this book happen, pursuing me to pick up the project after I had shelved it for quite a while because of its unpleasant nature. Nonetheless, John, like me, knew the book had to be done. I likewise thank Kevin Gallagher and so many others on the editing and production side who toil behind the scenes. Among them, Nick Vari did an excellent job copy editing. Between John and Nick, this was one of the smoothest editing processes I've ever experienced over a life of writing probably close to twenty books.

Finally, perhaps an odd and unexpected acknowledgment: I thank the saints. That is, favorite saints and religious writers of mine such as St. Catherine of Siena, St. Faustina, Pope St. John Paul II, Francis of Assisi, Padre Pio, Fulton Sheen, and Dante, among others. After painful days of reading these awful Marxists and wanting to flush away their mental-ideological sewage polluting my mind, I took refuge each evening in the edifying thoughts of the saints. Their direct connection to the divine, to Truth itself, allowed me to purge the toxic nonsense I had to read each day from the miserable purveyors of Marxist bilge that was a regrettable part of my day job. It is often said that one should not go to bed at night bitter or angry, whether with a spouse or whatever. I would add that one should not go to bed at night with bitter Marxist filth on the mind.

I thank the saints for a heavenly place to turn each night for peace of soul. And to them and the entire cloud of witnesses in the Church, I ask for intercession and prayer for me, for my family, and for the souls of every person mentioned in this book. And yes, that certainly includes Karl Marx as well.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Stephane Courtois et al, *The Black Book of Communism* (Harvard University Press, 1999), pp. 3-4.
- 2 Malia in Courtois, *Black Book*, pp. xvii-xviii.
- 3 Courtois, *Black Book*, p. 4. Some contributors to the book, namely, Nicolas Werth and Jean-Louis Margolin, disassociated themselves with the number 100 million, claiming that it was approximated and not completely accurate. See Ron Radosh, "The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, and Repression," *First Things*, February 2000. Also see: Robert Stacy McCain, "Communism's Atrocities Detailed in 'Black Book,'" *Washington Times*, September 21, 2000.
- 4 See website of the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation: <https://www.victimsofcommunism.org/memorial>.
- 5 Malia in Courtois, *Black Book*, p. x.
- 6 Courtois, *Black Book*, p. 4.
- 7 See Alexander Yakovlev, *A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 32; Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *Alexander Solzhenitsyn Speaks to the West* (London: The Bodley Head, 1978), p. 17; and Lee Edwards, editor, *The Collapse of Communism* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1999), p. xiii. Edwards cites figures by political scientist R. J. Rummel, who draws on the research of Solzhenitsyn, Robert Conquest, and others, thereby estimating that the USSR was responsible for the death of 61.9 million from 1917-87.
- 8 See Rummel's classic book, *Death by Government* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1994), which is posted online at <https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/NOTE1.HTM>.
- 9 Edwards, *The Collapse of Communism*, p. xiii.
- 10 The latest figures of 70-million plus by Mao are recorded in the seminal work, by Jung Chang and Jon Halliday, *Mao: The Unknown Story* (New York: Knopf, 2005). On Mao, the *Black Book* records 65 million dead (page 4).
- 11 See my discussion in the North Korea section of Paul Kengor, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Communism* (Washington, DC: Regnery, 2017).
- 12 During the sixty-four-year Spanish Inquisition period (1481–1545), the highest earliest estimates, which, according to the latest scholarship, were far too high, were that some 31,912 were killed. See the early authoritative work on the subject: J. A. Llorente, *A Critical History of the Inquisition of Spain* (1823), pp. 575–83.
- 13 Located in "Ronald Reagan: Pre-Presidential Papers: Selected Radio Broadcasts, 1975-1979," January 1975 to March 1977, Box 1, RRL. For a full transcript, see: Kiron Skinner, Annelise

Anderson, and Martin Anderson, editors, *Reagan: A Life in Letters* (NY: Free Press, 2003), pp. 10-12.

- 14 I say this as the author of full spiritual biographies of books with titles such as *God and Ronald Reagan: A Spiritual Life*, *God and George W. Bush: A Spiritual Life*, and *God and Hillary Clinton: A Spiritual Life*. Those books covered each of their subjects biographically from first to last page.
- 15 I will discuss this later with the case of the late Rev. Richard Wurmbrand specifically.
- 16 Marx's only son, young Edgar, wrote a letter to his father in March 1854 addressing him as "My Dear Devil." Richard Wurmbrand makes a big deal of this letter in his book *Marx & Satan*, aptly wondering what son would address his father this way. (Wurmbrand, *Marx & Satan*, p. 46.) Sympathetic biographers of Marx, if they mention the letter at all, say nothing about such a strange choice of greeting one's father. (See, for instance: Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 240.) Personally, I am not sure what to make of this one. I do not want to overstate its significance, especially if the salutation was done playfully, as one imagines and hopes it oddly was, but I also do not want to ignore it. Marx actually adored Edgar, and was heartbroken when Edgar died. Readers can make of the salutation what they will. In the larger scheme of Marx, however, it at least warrants suspicion. Full citations: Richard Wurmbrand, *Marx & Satan* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1986); and Mary Gabriel, *Love and Capital: Karl and Jenny Marx and the Birth of a Revolution* (New York: Little, Brown, 2011).
- 17 These, too, I will deal with. It is not always entirely clear when these are used playfully or figuratively. Marx's detractors opt for the latter, whereas his hagiographers either opt for the former or say nothing at all.
- 18 That most assuredly applies to my spiritual biographies of Ronald Reagan, George W. Bush, and Hillary Clinton.
- 19 Robert Payne, *Marx: A Biography* (NY: Simon & Schuster, 1968), pp. 315, 317. Tellingly, Francis Wheen does not make fun of Robert Payne for this statement or Payne's wider treatment of Marx's "demons," unlike Wheen's treatment of Richard Wurmbrand's statements on Marx and the devil. Wheen takes Payne more seriously, probably because Payne is an academic and not a pastor or a seeming right-wing anti-communist. See Payne quoted in Francis Wheen, *Karl Marx: A Life* (New York: Norton, 1999), p. 3.
- 20 Earl Browder, *Communism in the United States* (New York: International Publishers, 1935), p. 335.
- 21 Browder, *Communism in the United States*, p. 55.
- 22 Engels letter to Marx dated November 23-24, 1847, posted at: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/11/prin-com.htm>.
- 23 <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/manuscripts/comm.htm#44CC4>.
- 24 <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm#a4>.
- 25 Among other sources, the authoritative www.marxists.org historical archive states that on August 28, 1844 "Marx and Engels meet in Paris; this is the beginning of a lifelong friendship and joint work." <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/bio/marx/lifeandwork.htm>.
- 26 See my treatment of this subject at length in Paul Kengor, *Takedown: From Communists to Progressives, How the Left Has Sabotaged Family and Marriage* (Washington, D.C.: WND Books, 2015). In that book, I deal at length with the question of to what extent Marx and Engels literally desired the "abolition" of the family. Since the publication of that book in 2015, I have noticed this line from Robert Payne's 1968 biography of Marx: "He is perfectly serious when he demands the abolition of the family." See Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 173.
- 27 Karl Marx, "Suppression of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*," *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (final issue), no. 301, May 18, 1849, posted at

https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Articles_from_the_NRZ.pdf.

Note: Marx was editor-in-chief of *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*.

28 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 113.

29 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 144-46.

30 See Grigori Zinoviev, "Lenin: Speech to the Petrograd Soviet Celebrating Lenin's Recovery from Wounds Made in the Attempt on His Life," August 30, 1918, posted at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/zinoviev/works/1918/lenin/ch18.htm>.

31 Quoted in V. I. Lenin, "Can 'Jacobinism' Frighten the Working Class?" first published in *Pravda* No. 90, July 7 (June 24), 1917, and later published in *Lenin Collected Works*, Vol. 25 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977), pp. 121-22. Posted online at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1917/jul/07a.htm>.

32 Quoted by Trotsky, *The History of the Russian Revolution*, p. 395. See 1932 edition translated by Max Eastman and posted online at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1930/hrr/index.htm>.

33 These Lenin letters are quoted in Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *Alexander Solzhenitsyn Speaks to the West* (London: The Bodley Head, 1978), pp. 48, 54.

34 One Hegel scholar wrote, "Hegel is a Christian, but not an orthodox one by the Nicene Creed. He denies the precedence of the Father, from whom the Son and the Spirit proceed. He denies that lordship is the meaning of divinity, so that Christ manifests divinity only as the risen Lord. The true definition of divinity is Spirit. But Hegel is not an ancient Gnostic like Marcion or Valentinus. He does not denigrate the body as the kingdom of the devil. He affirms the incarnation and construes natures as the logos made flesh, as spirit, i.e., the infinite Christ. He is a modern, Joachimite Gnostic: world history is the story of the logos making itself flesh in the rational state and human rights. ... [Hegelian philosophy] is still Christian even if not orthodox. To be a heretic one must after all first be a Christian." See Clark Butler, *New Perspectives on Hegel's Philosophy of Religion* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1992), pp. 139, 141.

35 Kenneth Alan, *Explorations in Classical Sociological Theory* (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press, 2005), p. 72.

36 See Raines, *Marx on Religion*, p. vii.

37 What communists and socialists (including Marx and Engels and Lenin and even Mao, among others) mean by "democracy" is very different from what modern Americans mean by it.

38 Grant Havers, "A Christian Hegel in Canada," *Modern Age*, Winter 2019, p. 51.

39 See McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, p. 25.

40 Grant Havers, "A Christian Hegel in Canada," *Modern Age*, Winter 2019, p. 54.

41 See Sperber, p. 63.

42 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 65-66.

43 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 65-66, 69.

44 Fulton J. Sheen, *The Church, Communism, and Democracy* (New York: Dell Publishing), p. 138.

45 McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, p. 34.

46 See, among others, McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, p. 26; Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 29; and Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 73.

47 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 66.

48 See Friedrich Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, first published in 1886, translated and published in 1946 by Progress Publishers, posted at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1886/ludwig-feuerbach/ch01.htm#013>.

49 Quoted in McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, p. 34; and Wheen, *Karl Marx*, pp. 31-32.

50 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 73.

51 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 74-75.

52 Wheen, *Karl Marx*, p. 34.

53 Wheen, *Karl Marx*, pp. 40-42.

54 “Loutish philistine” is Wheen’s description; “untrustworthy egoist” is Marx’s. Wheen, *Karl Marx*, pp. 41-42.

55 Wheen, *Karl Marx*, pp. 41-42.

56 See Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 104, 439-40.

57 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 439-40.

58 See version posted online at [Marxists.org: https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/bakunin/works/godstate/index.htm](https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/bakunin/works/godstate/index.htm). All of the quotations herein are pulled from that online version.

59 This is stated by Alinsky in the opening page of his magnum opus *Rules for Radicals*.

60 Karl Marx, introduction to “A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right,” published in *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, February 7 and 10, 1844 (in Paris), posted at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/critique-hpr/intro.htm>.

61 See, for instance, Acts 4 and Matthew 25. Scholars debate this.

62 Marx, introduction to “A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right.”

63 For one analysis and case in point, see Peter Thompson, “Karl Marx, part 1: Religion, the wrong answer to the right question,” *The Guardian*, April 4, 2011, posted at <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/belief/2011/apr/04/karl-marx-religion>.

64 There are two common translation of this Sept. 1843 letter to Arnold Ruge. One states that Marx calls for: “the *ruthless criticism of the existing order*.” (Italics are Marx’s.) In another translation, Marx states, “I am referring to *ruthless criticism* of all that exists.” (Italics are Marx’s.) See https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/letters/43_09-alt.htm and https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/letters/43_09.htm.

65 On this, see Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 127-30.

66 Quoted by Thomas M. Magstadt and Peter M. Schotten, *Understanding Politics: Ideas, Institutions, and Issues* (NY: St. Martin’s Press, 1993), p. 39.

67 Karl Marx, *The Class Struggles in France* (New York: HOUSE, 1964), p. 114.

68 Karl Marx, “The Communism of the *Rheinischer Beobachter*,” *Deutsche-Brusseler-Zeitung*, September 12, 1847, published as Marx, “The Social Principles of Christianity,” in Saul K. Padover, ed., *On Religion: Karl Marx*, The Karl Marx Library, Volume V (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974), pp. 93-94.

69 Marx wrote this in his 1844, *Estranged Labor*. See John Raines, ed., *Marx on Religion* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002), p. 11; and version posted online at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/manuscripts/labour.htm/>.

70 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 82.

71 This is one version of several similar such translations adapted from Aristotle’s classic *Politics*. My colleague Robert R. Reilly uses this particular rendition. Another translation, taken from the late Benjamin Jowett’s seminal translation, speaks of how “innovations” (also translated as “revolutions” or “revolutionary changes”) can “creep in through the private life of individuals.” A more recent translation by contemporary Aristotle scholars Irwin and Fine states, “And since people’s private ways of life also lead them to revolution ...” Two of my philosophy colleagues at Grove City College convey a strict Greek translation that reads “on account of private lives.”

72 Modern biographer Francis Wheen, a leftist who is highly sympathetic to Marx and goes through great lengths to defend him and to dismiss almost anything obviously negative about the man, rips Richard Wurmbrand in the introduction to his biography. He laughs at this “bizarre book published in 1976 by a famous American hot-gospeller, the Reverend Richard Wurmbrand, author of such imperishable masterpieces as *Tortured for Christ* (‘over two million copies sold’).” This is very uncharitable by Wheen. Wurmbrand was, in fact, tortured for Christ, and that chilling book explains why and how, which is why one can still find it on the shelves of probably over a million Christian households to this day. Why Wheen would deride him as an “American hot-gospeller” is hard to imagine (other than Wheen simply not liking the man); Wurmbrand was a Romanian who escaped to America after escaping the communist prisons in Romania in which he was brutalized for his faith. He actually never fit the mold of what one might envision as a “hot-gospeller.”

My one defense of Wheen’s attack on Wurmbrand is that I agree with Wheen that Wurmbrand does not offer hard proof for some of his more extreme charges against Marx, such as Marx’s possible participation in things that “reminds us of the inversions of the Satanic black mass” or perhaps involvement in a “highly secret Satanist church.” Many of these very-heated charges by Wurmbrand likewise frustrated me because of the lack of proof provided. Nonetheless, I grant far more authority to Richard Wurmbrand on the subject of communist torture and even Satanic influences and practices than I do Francis Wheen. Wurmbrand experienced those things. In fact, black Masses and worse took place in the prison of Pitesti in Romania, which Wurmbrand wrote about in *Tortured for Christ*. I will note that in the pages ahead.

Wheen argues against holding Marx and Marxism even partly responsible for the ideology that killed so many. I am convinced after reading Wheen that even if he personally found evidence of Marx engaging in outright Satanism, he would come up with a way to shrug it off. See Francis Wheen, *Karl Marx: A Life* (NY: W. W. Norton, 2001), pp. 2-4.

73 See Paul Johnson, *Intellectuals* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988); Gary North, “The Marx Nobody Knows,” in Yuri Maltsev, ed., *Requiem for Karl Marx* (Auburn, Alabama: Praxeology Press, Auburn University, 1993); Mark Skousen, *The Big Three in Economics: Adam Smith, Karl Marx, and John Maynard Keynes* (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2007); and Murray Rothbard, *An Austrian Perspective on the History of Economic Thought* (Auburn, Alabama: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2006).

74 See Bruce Mazlish, *The Meaning of Karl Marx* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

75 Robert Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx* (New York: New York University Press, 1971).

76 Even then, Payne was not the first to notice the strange religious side of Marx. Among others, see North, “The Marx Nobody Knows,” pp. 75-77.

77 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, p. 57.

78 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 59, 67.

79 See Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 73; and Johnson, *Intellectuals*, p. 55.

80 Again, see https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/letters/43_09-alt.htm and https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/letters/43_09.htm.

81 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, p. 57. On Lewis and Dante, see Marsha Daigle-Williamson, *Reflecting the Eternal: Dante’s Divine Comedy in the Novels of C. S. Lewis* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2015).

82 Johnson, *Intellectuals*, p. 54.

83 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 59.

84 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 62.

85 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, p. 57.

86 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, pp. 59-60.

- 87 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, p. 60.
- 88 Wurmbrand, *Marx & Satan*, p. 15.
- 89 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, pp. 62-63.
- 90 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, p. 63.
- 91 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 63.
- 92 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 64.
- 93 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 64.
- 94 For further details, see the excellent sleuthing of Payne in Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 64-65.
- 95 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, p. 63; and Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 59.
- 96 See the Old and New Testaments, Isaiah 7:10-14 and Luke 1:18-24, respectively.
- 97 Retrieved from Wikipedia, May 17, 2016.
- 98 See <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1837-pre/verse/verse21.htm>.
- 99 See the Chilean black-metal band that calls itself “Ilkim Oulanem.”
- 100 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, p. 60.
- 101 That is certainly an assertion that I cannot attest. See: Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 68-69, 72.
- 102 Johnson, *Intellectuals*, pp. 54-55.
- 103 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, pp. 60-61.
- 104 Ibid, p. 62.
- 105 Ibid, p. 63.
- 106 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 67, 73.
- 107 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 68, 73.
- 108 Wurmbrand, *Marx & Satan*, p. 19.
- 109 Payne, *The Unknown Karl Marx*, pp. 63-64.
- 110 See <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1837-pre/verse/verse24.htm>.
- 111 Wurmbrand, *Marx & Satan*, pp. viii, 25.
- 112 Ibid, p. 25.
- 113 <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/critique-hpr/intro.htm>.
- 114 “Letter from Heinrich Marx to son Karl,” Trier, March 2, 1837, published in *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 670-73, posted at www.marxists.org. Also see post at <http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon6/letters/papa/1837-fl2.html>. David McLellan uses a translation that reads this way: “I feel myself suddenly invaded by doubt and ask myself if your heart is equal to your intelligence and spiritual qualities, if it is open to the tender feelings which here on earth are so great a source of consolation for a sensitive soul; I wonder whether the peculiar demon, to which your heart is manifestly a prey, is the Spirit of God or that of Faust. I ask myself—and this is not the least of the doubts that assail my heart—if you will ever know a simple happiness and family joys, and render happy those around you.” David McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography* (London: Papermac, an imprint of Macmillan, 1995) p. 1. Mary Gabriel, another top and highly sympathetic biographer of Marx, uses the same translation of the letter posted at www.marxists.org. Gabriel finds the letter “poignant.” See Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 28.
- 115 See Raines, *Marx on Religion*, p. 15.
- 116 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 17-18.
- 117 See Jonathan Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life* (New York: W.W. Norton/Liveright, 2014), pp. 6-7, 11; and Mary Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 16.
- 118 McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, p. 2.

- 119 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 17. Mary Gabriel pegs the year of Heinrich's conversion as 1817. Mary Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 16.
- 120 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 18-20.
- 121 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 16.
- 122 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 18-20.
- 123 McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, p. 6.
- 124 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 23; and Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 17.
- 125 There are signs of this even in his August 1835 essay, "The Union of the Faithful with Christ," which he wrote as a seventeen-year-old student fulfilling his religious requirement for graduation from high school. At first glance, this seemingly nice reflection on the fifteenth chapter of John's Gospel is absent of some of the crucial fundamentals of the Christian faith and life.
- 126 See Padover, *On Religion: Karl Marx*, pp. xiv-xv.
- 127 Marx, "A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right," posted at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/critique-hpr/intro.htm>.
- 128 Karl Marx, "The Decay of Religious Authority," *New York Tribune*, 1854, printed in Raines, *Marx on Religion*, pp. 188-89.
- 129 For some modern scholarly, respected books (readable, not lengthy) on the Crusades, a subject that Christians ought to understand much better, especially since the Crusades are used as a club to beat Christianity, I recommend the works of Professor Jonathan Riley-Smith (Cambridge University), *The Crusades: A History*, and *What Were the Crusades?*, and Professor Thomas Madden (Saint Louis University), *The New Concise History of the Crusades*. Madden has also produced an edited volume, *Crusades: The Illustrated History* (University of Michigan Press, 2004). Also released more recently (2009) is Rodney Stark's *God's Battalions: The Case for the Crusades*.
- 130 Marx, "The Decay of Religious Authority."
- 131 Saul Padover, ed., *The Letters of Karl Marx* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979), p. 239; and Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 544.
- 132 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 544.
- 133 Marx, "Excerpts from *Das Capital*," published in Raines, *Marx on Religion*, p. 202.
- 134 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 27.
- 135 See Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 50-51. My translation comes from Payne. Also see version, "Letter from Marx to His Father," November 10, 1837, posted at https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1837-pre/letters/37_11_10.htm.
- 136 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 52.
- 137 Payne dates the letter as December 10, 1837. Other sources date it as December 9, 1837. Here I have used the source posted at www.marxists.org, which is a fuller and complete version. It is taken from *Marx-Engels Collected Works* Vol. 1 (NY: International Publishers, 1975), pp. 685-91: <http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon6/letters/papa/1837-fl7.html>.
- 138 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 54-55.
- 139 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 77.
- 140 One of the most influential early accounts of Marx's family life was Otto Ruhle, *Karl Marx: His Life and Works* (NY: Viking Press, 1929). Also considered landmarks were the collections done by German socialist Franz Mehring. Among more recent works, I will draw particularly from four sympathetic accounts by Marx biographers Francis Wheen, Mary Gabriel, Jonathan Sperber, and David McLellan. By frequently citing Wheen and Gabriel, who often engaged in

extremes to defend the worst of Marx (especially Wheen), I am hoping to avoid charges of an excessively one-sided bias. Moreover, as a Christian scholar, I do feel a moral responsibility to do my best to try to be fair to every subject, even a man who unleashed such a deadly ideology. Finally, I will add here that I believe the most original and elegantly written biographical work on Marx remains the fascinating research of Robert Payne, particularly his groundbreaking 1968 book. I have also drawn from older, negative biographical examinations of Marx by strident anti-Marxists, notably Paul Johnson and Fulton Sheen.

- 141 Quoted in Johnson, *Intellectuals*, p. 74.
- 142 Quoted in Fulton J. Sheen, *The Church, Communism, and Democracy* (New York: Dell Publishing), p. 140.
- 143 Mary Gabriel, whose perspective on all such negative Marx things is the complete opposite, always applying the utmost positive interpretation toward Marx, writes, "Some biographers have accused Marx of inexcusable callousness toward his father, claiming that he did not attend his funeral because he had better things to do. That is a misrepresentation of events. Having just left Trier, Karl did not return for the funeral because it would have been impossible to make it there on time, and in any case, he had said his goodbyes." Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 31.
- 144 Sheen, *The Church, Communism, and Democracy*, p. 140.
- 145 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 316.
- 146 Sheen, *The Church, Communism, and Democracy*, p. 140.
- 147 Sheen, *The Church, Communism, and Democracy*, p. 140.
- 148 Sheen, *The Church, Communism, and Democracy* (, p. 140.
- 149 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 339.
- 150 Sheen, *The Church, Communism, and Democracy*, p. 141.
- 151 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 303.
- 152 See, among others, Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 304; and Wheen, *Karl Marx*, pp. 262-63.
- 153 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 339.
- 154 This Prussian police report is infamous and often quoted. See, among others, Johnson, *Intellectuals*, p. 73; Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, pp. 234-35; and Wheen, *Karl Marx*, p. 170.
- 155 Johnson, *Intellectuals*, p. 73. See also McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, p. 256; and Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 347-48.
- 156 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 343.
- 157 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 346, 349; and "Letter from Karl Marx to Friedrich Engels," January 20, 1864, printed in Raines, *Marx on Religion*, p. 238.
- 158 McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, p. 311; and Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 350-51.
- 159 Johnson, *Intellectuals*, p. 73; and Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 350.
- 160 Troy Jollimore, "The private life of Karl Marx," *Salon*, September 18, 2011.
- 161 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Reminiscences of Marx and Engels* (Moscow: Foreign Language Press, 1959), p. 281.
- 162 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 108.
- 163 For more, see Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 63.
- 164 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, pp. 46, 237.
- 165 Eleanor married and took the name Eleanor Aveling. See Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Reminiscences of Marx and Engels* (Moscow: Foreign Language Press, 1959), pp. 252-53. Also see Wheen, *Karl Marx*, p. 215.
- 166 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, pp. 286, 364.
Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 317.

- 168 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 317.
- 169 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 316-18.
- 170 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 132-38.
- 171 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 315.
- 172 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 79.
- 173 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 259.
- 174 Troy Jollimore, "The private life of Karl Marx," *Salon*, September 18, 2011.
- 175 Sheen, *The Church, Communism, and Democracy*, p. 140.
- 176 Johnson, *Intellectuals*, p. 77. See letters in McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, pp. 212-13, 241-47.
- 177 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 256.
- 178 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 257.
- 179 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 293-94.
- 180 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, pp. 5-7, 244-45.
- 181 See Wheen, *Karl Marx: A Life*, p. 249; Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, pp. 5-7; Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 347-48; and McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, p. 306.
- 182 McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, pp. 248, 252.
- 183 The best presentation of this episode was done by Jonathan Sperber. See Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 262-63.
- 184 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 81.
- 185 Johnson, *Intellectuals*, pp. 79-80; and Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 255-59. Payne does note that Lenchen was tough and took no guff from Karl. She could give it right back to him. Still, he nonetheless paid her squat and exploited her shamelessly.
- 186 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 260.
- 187 McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, p. 249.
- 188 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, pp. 212-14.
- 189 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 262-63.
- 190 Wheen, *Karl Marx*, p. 49.
- 191 Johnson, *Intellectuals*, pp. 78-80.
- 192 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 469-70.
- 193 Wheen, *Karl Marx*, p. 350.
- 194 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 469-70.
- 195 Quoted in Padover, *The Letters of Karl Marx*, p. 338.
- 196 Mary Gabriel, "Marx's Not-So-Marxist Marriage," *The Daily Beast*, September 21, 2011.
- 197 Some sources claim three daughters committed suicide; some claim only one. No doubt at least two of them did. The sources on this vary terribly.
- 198 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 453.
- 199 Johnson, *Intellectuals*, pp. 78-80.
- 200 Johnson, *Intellectuals*, pp. 62, 78-79.
- 201 Marx wrote this in November 1882, still fourteen years after Lafargue and Laura married. See Wheen, *Karl Marx*, p. 291.
- 202 Email correspondence with Stephen Schwartz, June 14, 2018.
- 203 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 496.

- 204 Though Wheen does quote those insults, he remarkably writes of Marx's offensive, horrid tract on "the Jewish Question:" "Some passages from 'On the Jewish Question' have an equally rancid flavor if taken out of context—which they usually are." Wheen adds, "In spite of the clumsy phraseology and crude stereotyping, the essay was actually written as a defence of the Jews." To the contrary, Marx's essay is pure anti-Semitic tripe and should not be defended. If the likes of Wheen found an essay like this in the past of a conservative it would be hoisted on a petard to forever label the writer a vile anti-Semite. Wheen, *Karl Marx*, pp. 55-56.
- 205 Quoted in Padover, *The Letters of Karl Marx*, p. 338.
- 206 See Dmitri N. Shalin, *Pragmatism & Democracy* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2011), p. 197; Wheen, *Karl Marx*, p. 55; and Johnson, *Intellectuals*, p. 62.
- 207 Walter Williams, "Marx's racism," nationally syndicated column, June 21, 2006.
- 208 Padover, *On Religion: Karl Marx*, pp. 169-92. The following excerpts and quotations from "On the Jewish Question" are taken from Padover's edition.
- 209 Padover, *On Religion: Karl Marx*, p. xiii.
- 210 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 128-29.
- 211 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 65, 129.
- 212 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 130-31.
- 213 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 133.
- 214 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 91.
- 215 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 82.
- 216 See Johnson, *Intellectuals*, p. 56.
- 217 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 133.
- 218 Shalin, *Pragmatism & Democracy*, p. 197; and Williams, "Marx's racism."
- 219 Weikart, who quotes this letter, argues that despite Marx "probably father[ing] an illegitimate child," he was nonetheless "apparently a model husband and remained faithful to his wife." Weikart wrote this in 1994, perhaps prior to his knowledge of more recent research on Marx's woefully poor conduct as a husband. Of course, a husband who fathers an illegitimate child to the family's young nanny is not a model or faithful husband.
- 220 Quoted by Richard Weikart, "Marx, Engels, and the Abolition of the Family," *History of European Ideas*, vol. 18, no. 5, 1994, p. 668. Marx's defenders will probably want to argue that he was speaking tongue-in-cheek, given the high cost of a man (especially a man like Marx) financially supporting a large family (as opposed to a single man with no such obligation). Personally, I'm inclined to a less charitable interpretation, given the realities of Marx's life and attitudes. Notably, Mary Gabriel does not defend it. Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 239.
- 221 McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, pp. 305 and 311; and Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 466. Also see translation by Mary Gabriel, who quotes the statement from Marx as: "What could be more asinine for people of wide aspirations than to get married at all." Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, pp. 265 and 338. On Jenny's miseries, also see Gabriel, pp. 77, 244-45, 264-65, 287-90, 299.
- 222 Wheen, *Karl Marx*, p. 291.
- 223 Most online and other biographical accounts list Jenny's death as December 2, whereas some older accounts list December 5.
- 224 See Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, p. 490; Wheen, *Karl Marx*, p. 376; and Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 486.
- 225 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 541.

- 226 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, pp. 504-5; and Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 396, 546-47.
- 227 See Johnson, *Intellectuals*, pp. 78-80; and Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 513-14.
- 228 On Shaw as a dupe, see Paul Kengor, *Dupes: How America's Adversaries Have Manipulated Progressives for a Century* (Wilmington, Delaware: ISI Books, 2010), pp. 10, 54-55.
- 229 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 513-14.
- 230 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, pp. 515, 525-30; and Wheen, *Karl Marx*, pp. 385-86.
- 231 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, pp. 591-94.
- 232 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 532.
- 233 Gabriel, *Love and Capital*, pp. 591-94.
- 234 Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx: The Story of His Life* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1962), p. 88.
- 235 Ibid.
- 236 Ibid, p. 89.
- 237 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, p. 139.
- 238 Sperber, *Karl Marx: A 19th Century Life*, pp. 138-41.
- 239 David McLellan refers to it as a "satirical poem" written by Edgar Bauer, the brother of Bruno. He refers to it as such, with Edgar Bauer as the author, in the text of his biography of Marx on page 27. In the accompanying footnote, however (footnote 103, carried on page 55), he lists the poem's co-authors as Bauer and Engels. See McLellan, *Karl Marx: A Biography*, pp. 27, 55. To the contrary, Franz Mehring records the author of this poem is Friedrich Engels, which was published as *A Christian Epic*, written in four cantos. See Mehring, *Karl Marx: The Story of His Life*, p. 92. The authoritative website, www.marxists.org, which is the most up-to-date of all these sources, posts all four cantos with Engels as the sole author—at least at the time of this writing. Still another excellent source, albeit publishing his biography way back in 1968, when the provenance of the poem might have been in question, is Robert Payne, and Payne lists the author as Edgar Bauer. Payne, notably, makes no intimation that the poem was anything but serious. He also says that the poem was written about the various members of the Doctors' Club, with each of the leading members described at some length, including the stanza on Marx. See Payne, *Marx*, p. 81.
- How to reconcile these differing opinions among serious, good biographers? I believe this might be the answer: Edgar Bauer and Friedrich Engels were both part of the Doctor's Club. Edgar Bauer already knew Marx very well, whereas Engels was about to meet him, and obviously come to know him very well. Perhaps Edgar Bauer had drafted a portion of this longer "poem" on Marx (and many various other assorted, rambling things) and then Engels joined in and expanded upon it, with both thus sharing in some degree of authorship. The precise lines which each man wrote is not totally clear among biographers.
- 240 Mehring, *Karl Marx: The Story of His Life*, p. 92.
- 241 Quoted in Mehring, *Karl Marx: The Story of His Life*, pp. 92-93.
- 242 Again, Payne credits the authorship of the poem to Edgar Bauer, which is perhaps even more significant because, as Payne notes, at the time of the writing of this poem Edgar knew Marx well, and Engels did not. What is much more important to Payne, and really to all of us, is not what this passage might say about the author but the subject—that is, about Marx. Payne, *Marx*, pp. 81-82.
- 243 For consistency, I will stick with my first translation.
- 244 Ibid.

- 245 This is the recollection of Edward Aveling, the husband of Marx's daughter Eleanor. Quoted in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Reminiscences of Marx and Engels* (Moscow: Foreign Language Press, 1959), p. 316.
- 246 Weikart, "Marx, Engels, and the Abolition of the Family," pp. 665-67.
- 247 See, among others, H. Kent Geiger, *The Family in Soviet Russia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 11; and Weikart, "Marx, Engels, and the Abolition of the Family," p. 657.
- 248 Weikart, "Marx, Engels, and the Abolition of the Family," pp. 665-66.
- 249 Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (New York, NY: International Publishers, 1942), p. 67.
- 250 Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, p. 67.
- 251 Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, p. 67.
- 252 Geiger, *The Family in Soviet Russia*, pp. 20-21, 33.
- 253 The "opiate of the masses" remark is well-known. The source for the quote, "communism begins where atheism begins," is Fulton J. Sheen, *Communism and the Conscience of the West* (Indianapolis and NY: Bobbs-Merrill, 1948). Sheen, who spoke and read several languages, translated the quote into English from an un-translated Marx work. See also. Sheen, *The Church, Communism, and Democracy*, pp. 138-39.
- 254 Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, p. 74.
- 255 Quoted in John Koehler, *Spies in the Vatican* (NY: Pegasus Books, 2009), p. 1.
- 256 See chapter 11, "Communism and Religion," in Bukharin's *The ABC of Communism*, written in 1920, first published in English in 1922, published by Penguin Books in 1969, and posted online at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/bukharin/works/1920/abc/11.htm>.
- 257 Quoted in Archie Brown, *The Gorbachev Factor* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 291-92.
- 258 As cited by Richard Pipes, *Communism: A History* (NY: The Modern Library, 2001), p. 98.
- 259 Leon Trotsky, "Speech to the Thirteenth Party Congress," May 26, 1924. In *The Challenge of the Left Opposition: 1923-1925*, Naomi Allen ed. (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1975), p. 161.
- 260 Kennan's seminal work was his "Sources of Soviet Conduct," published in the elite journal *Foreign Affairs* in July 1947. The article publicly presented his secret/historic "Long Telegram" sent from Moscow in February 1946.
- 261 Reagan, "The President's News Conference," January 21, 1982.
- 262 A handwritten draft of the text is on file at the Reagan Library. Located in "Ronald Reagan: Pre-Presidential Papers: Selected Radio Broadcasts, 1975-1979," April 1977 to September 1977, Box 2, RRL. Reagan, "Religious Freedom," radio broadcast, July 31, 1978.
- 263 The opening line in the introduction to a volume of collected works of Vladimir Lenin on religion begins, "Atheism is a natural and inseparable part of Marxism, of the theory and practice of scientific socialism." See V. I. Lenin, *Religion* (London: CPGB-ML, 2012), p. 5, posted at http://ciml.250x.com/archive/lenin/english/lenin_religion.pdf. The original edition of this volume was first published by International Publishers, specifically, the Little Lenin Library, in New York in 1933.
- 264 Lenin, "Socialism and Religion," first published in *Novaya Zhizn*, December 3, 1905. Translation taken from V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965), pp. 83-87. www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1905/dec/03.htm.
- 265 Edward Aveling quoted in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Reminiscences of Marx and Engels* (Moscow: Foreign Language Press, 1959), p. 316.
- 266 Lenin, "Socialism and Religion," first published in *Novaya Zhizn*, December 3, 1905. Translation taken from V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10 (Moscow: Progress Publishers,

- 1965), pp. 83-87. www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1905/dec/03.htm.
- 267 Bukharin, "Communism and Religion."
- 268 Lenin, "Socialism and Religion," *Novaya Zhizn*, December 3, 1905.
- 269 Lenin, "Socialism and Religion," *Novaya Zhizn*, December 3, 1905.
- 270 Lenin, "The Attitude of the Workers' Party to Religion," first published in *Proletary*, No. 45, May 26, 1909. Translation taken from V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1973), pp. 402-13. See www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1909/may/13.htm.
- 271 Dean Dettloff, "The Catholic Case for Communism," *America Magazine*, July 23, 2019. <https://www.americamagazine.org/faith/2019/07/23/catholic-case-communism>. Also see the defense of the article by *America Magazine's* editor-in-chief, Matt Malone, S.J., "Why we published an essay sympathetic to communism:" <https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2019/07/23/why-we-published-essay-sympathetic-communism>.
- 272 Lenin, "The Attitude of the Workers' Party to Religion," first published in *Proletary*, No. 45, May 26, 1909. Translation taken from V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1973), pp. 402-13. See www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1909/may/13.htm.
- 273 On Lenin's use of the term "useful idiots," see my discussion in Kengor, *Dupes*, pp. 2-3.
- 274 See Lenin, *Religion*, pp. 18, 26, 41.
- 275 Lenin, *Religion*, p. 9.
- 276 Another translation of the word is "necrophily." Lenin, Letter to Maxim Gorky, written November 13 or 14, 1913. First published in *Pravda*, No. 51, March 2, 1924. Translation taken from V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976), pp. 121-124. See www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/nov/00mg.htm.
- 277 See James Thrower, *God's Commissar: Marxism-Leninism as the Civil Religion of Soviet Society* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), p. 39.
- 278 See J. M. Bochenski, "Marxism-Leninism and Religion," in B. R. Bociurkiw et al, eds., *Religion and Atheism in the USSR and Eastern Europe* (London: MacMillan, 1975), p. 11.
- 279 Quoted in Dmitri Volkogonov, *Lenin: A New Biography* (NY: The Free Press, 1994), p. 373.
- 280 This item is published in Yakovlev, *A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia*, p. 157.
- 281 The Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League took place in Moscow from October 2-10, 1920 and was attended by an estimated six hundred delegates. Lenin addressed the first session the evening of October 2. The transcript was published in *Pravda* on October 5, 6, and 7, 1920. It also appears in Lenin's *Collected Works*, volume 31. See posting at: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/oct/02.htm>.
- 282 Lenin, Letter to Maxim Gorky, written November 13 or 14, 1913.
- 283 See Daniel Peris, *Storming the Heavens: The Soviet League of the Militant Godless* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).
- 284 Quoted in Pipes, *Communism: A History*, pp. 68-69.
- 285 Quoted in Barry Lee Woolley, *Adherents of Permanent Revolution: A History of the Fourth (Trotskyist) International* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1999), pp. 4-5.
- 286 Among others, see Woolley, p. 5.
- 287 Alexander Solzhenitsyn, "Men Have Forgotten God," Templeton Prize Award speech, May 10, 1983.
- 288 This is not to say that the Russian leaders before the Bolsheviks were model "Christians," or that they were all Christians. The point, however, is that, generally, their *attitude* toward Christianity was far less hostile than that of the Bolsheviks.
- 289 Yakovlev, *A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia*, pp. 155, 163.
- 290 See Thrower, *God's Commissar*, p. 64; Jennifer McDowell, "Soviet Civil Ceremonies," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 1974, pp. 265-79; and Powell,

- “Rearing the New Soviet Man,” in Bociurkiw and Strong, *Religion and Atheism in the USSR and Eastern Europe*, pp. 160-65.
- 291 W. Bruce Lincoln, *Red Victory: A History of the Russian Civil War* (NY: Simon and Schuster, 1989), pp. 476-77.
- 292 Hedrick Smith, *The Russians* (London: Sphere Books, 1976), p. 396.
- 293 See, among others, Yakovlev, *A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia*, pp. 162-67; Smith, *The Russians*, p. 396; Lincoln, *Red Victory*, pp. 476-77; and “A Restored Look for the Long-Ignored Churches of Russia,” Associated Press, July 23, 1976, p. B3.
- 294 Lincoln, *Red Victory*, p. 474.
- 295 On this, see Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918-1956* (NY: Harper and Row, 1974), pp. 37-38.
- 296 Volkogonov, *Lenin*, pp. 374, 380.
- 297 See Kengor, *A Pope and a President: John Paul II, Ronald Reagan, and the Extraordinary Untold Story of the 20th Century* (Wilmington, Delaware: ISI Books, 2017), pp. 28-31; Volkogonov, *Lenin*, pp. 29, 325-27, 345-51; and Yakovlev, *A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia*, pp. 155-61.
- 298 Volkogonov, *Lenin*, pp. 376-78.
- 299 Yakovlev, *A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia*, p. 168.
- 300 James Billington, “Christianity and History,” 125th anniversary lecture series, Grove City College, Grove City, Pennsylvania, September 27, 2001.
- 301 Radzinsky speaking in interview for A&E Biography of Joseph Stalin, “The Red Terror.”
- 302 Mikhail Gorbachev, *Memoirs* (NY: Doubleday, 1996), p. 328.
- 303 Mikhail Gorbachev, *On My Country and the World*, (NY: Columbia University Press, 2000), pp. 20-21.
- 304 See Paul Dixon, “Religion in the Soviet Union,” [Marxist.com](http://www.marxist.com/religion-soviet-union170406.htm), April 17, 2006, first published in *Workers’ International News* in October 1945, posted at <http://www.marxist.com/religion-soviet-union170406.htm>. See also Yakovlev, *A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia*, p. 164.
- 305 This passage is taken from an article, “A Life of Lasting Thankfulness,” by Reverend Yuri Sipko, member of the Russian Union of Christian Baptists. Article excerpt is included in transcript of interview with Sipko. Correspondence received by author June 21, 1998.
- 306 Richard Wurmbrand, *Tortured for Christ* (Bartlesville, OK: Living Sacrifice Book Company, 1998), p. 65.
- 307 H. W. Crocker III, *Triumph: The Power and Glory of the Catholic Church* (NY: Three Rivers Press, 2001), pp. 407-8.
- 308 “Dry,” said Sheen, because he primarily suffered mental torture rather than being physically annihilated like martyrs of old.
- 309 Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty, *Memoirs* (NY: Macmillan Publishing, 1974).
- 310 Again, see “The Communist War on Religion,” posted at www.globalmuseumoncommunism.org.
- 311 See Bertram D. Wolfe, *A Life in Two Centuries* (Stein and Day, 1981), pp. 403-4.
- 312 Wurmbrand, *Tortured for Christ*, pp. 33-38.
- 313 See <https://www.thegenocideofthesouls.org/public/english/video-historians/>, retrieved July 30, 2019.
- 314 The citations are reprinted below as they appear at the website.
- 315 Virgil Ierunca, *The Pitesti Phenomenon*, Paris, 1981, p. 37.
- 316 Eugen Magirescu, *The Devil’s Mill: Memories of Pitesti Prison*, Editura Fronde, Alba-Iulia, Paris, 1994, p. 6.

- 317 Eugen Magirescu, *The Devil's Mill*, in *Memoria* no. 13, p. 38.
- 318 Ion Balan, *The Prison Camp Regime in Romania, 1945-1964*, Fundatia Academia Civica, 2000, p. 225.
- 319 Alin Muresan, *Pitesti: The Chronicle of an Assisted Suicide*, Polirom, Bucharest, 2008.
- 320 Alin Muresan, *Pitesti: The Chronicle of an Assisted Suicide*, Polirom, Bucharest, 2008.
- 321 Costin Merisca, *The Pitesti Tragedy*, Jassy, 1997, p. 70-71.
- 322 Justin Stefan Paven, *The Hell of Pitesti*, in *Memoria*, no. 22, p. 66.
- 323 Yakovlev, *A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia*, pp. 7-8, 158.
- 324 Yakovlev, *A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia*, pp. 8, 26-27, 87, 155-68.
- 325 Pope Pius IX, *Qui Pluribus (On Faith and Religion)*, November 9, 1946, posted at <https://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius09/p9quiplu.htm>.
- 326 In their critical 2013 book *Disinformation*, Ion Mihai Pacepa and Ron Rychlak chronicled the crass art of Kremlin deception, an effort with no moral scruples, and one particularly aimed at defaming, maligning, and slandering religious individuals. Pacepa, a former Romanian general, was the highest-ranking intelligence official to defect the Soviet bloc, and a witness to many of the events the book describes. Pacepa and Rychlak gave special attention to the scandalously successful case against the vehemently anti-communist Pope Pius XII, who was public enemy no. 1 to Stalin at the start of the Cold War. They show that the attack against Pius was launched with a 1945 Radio Moscow broadcast that first echoed the bald-faced lie of a smear, "Hitler's Pope." The Soviets understood that Pius XII was a mortal threat to their ideology and thus manufactured their big lie that Pius had been pro-Hitler. They embarked on an unholy crusade to destroy the pope, his reputation, scandalize his flock, and foment division among faiths. For the Soviets, this became a standard tactic. They would sling the pro-Nazi charge at numerous Church figures like Cardinals Mindszenty and Stepinac (Yugoslavia) and Wyszynski (Poland).
- 327 Here's a full post: <http://geocities.ws/caleb1x/documents/communism.html>. And here's a post from a Catholic website based in Brazil (in the original Latin): <http://www.montfort.org.br/eng/documentos/decretos/anticomunismo/>. A very important question is raised in the comments section of this latter website: "This decree from Pius XII's Holy Office, confirmed by John XXIII in 1959 is still valid. ... The penalty for those who disobey the prohibition of aiding communism (or its variants) under any aspect (including voting for filo-communist parties) is automatic excommunication." This is a crucial question with undeniable modern relevance, especially given that the leading Jesuit publication, *America*, 70 years later, in July 2019, scandalously published an outrageous piece titled "The Catholic Case for Communism," written by *America's* Canadian correspondent who (Rod Dreher reports) is a member of the Canadian Communist Party.
- 328 See my article: Paul Kengor, "Vatican II's Unpublished Condemnations of Communism," *Crisis Magazine*, November 30, 2017. This section is adapted from that article.
- 329 The source is Matthew Cullinan Hoffman, who I interviewed for the November 2017 article for *Crisis*.
- 330 Thomas C. Reeves, *America's Bishop: The Life and Times of Fulton J. Sheen* (Encounter Books, 2001), pp. 87-88.
- 331 Reeves, *America's Bishop*, p. 88.
- 332 Sheen, *The Church, Communism and Democracy*, pp. 61, 122, 138.
- 333 Kathleen L. Riley, *Fulton J. Sheen: An American Catholic Response to the Twentieth Century* (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 2004), p. 149.
- 334 The full quote from Pope Francis is: "The Marxist ideology is wrong. But I have met many Marxists in my life who are good people." Francis said this in December 2013 to the Italian newspaper *La Stampa*. The issue of Francis and communism is complicated. Francis, admittedly, doesn't have much of a track record of papal statements or actions against

communism. Two instances stand out: For one, Pope Francis in Rome in April 2017 lamented “the many Christians killed by the demented ideologies of the last century.” It is assumed that this was a reference to communism, which it surely was, even as communism or Marxism was not singled out by name even once by Francis. The same was true for a slightly clearer occasion in June 2019 in Romania, where Francis beatified seven communist-era bishops. On this occasion, Francis said that the martyred bishops had “endured suffering and gave their lives to oppose an illiberal ideological system that oppressed the fundamental rights of the human person.” Once again, Francis did not once mention communism or Marxism. The accusations that Pope Francis is soft on communism are justified. It might be more accurate to say that he is simply silent on communism. For a highly critical assessment of Francis on communism, coming from a colleague and very negative source who nonetheless has done his homework on Francis, including visiting and digging deep into his Argentinian roots, see George Neumayr, “Where Bergoglio Buried His Communist Mentor,” *The American Spectator*, August 28, 2019. Neumayr provides a decidedly different treatment from the likes of Francis biographer Austen Ivereigh. Still, it is hard to dispute Neumayr’s alarming facts on Francis, particularly Francis’s early roots with Latin American communist Esther Ballestrino de Careaga.

- 335 In 2015, the word “socialism” was the most looked-up word at [Merriam-Webster.com](https://www.merriam-webster.com). That reflects the growing interest, but it also reflects the enduring confusion over what the word means. That confusion has always been aided by those wielding the term. Ask ten socialists to define socialism and you’ll get ten different answers. See Alex Adrianson, “Socialism Can Never Work,” *The Insider* (Heritage Foundation), Spring 2016, p. 2.
- 336 The name change came in 1903 when these Russian socialists split into two factions, the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. See, among others, Pipes, *Communism: A History*, pp. ix-x.
- 337 See Bertram D. Wolfe, “A Party of a New Type,” in Milorad M. Drachkovitch and Branko Lazitch, eds., *The Comintern: Historical Highlights—Essays, Recollections, Documents* (New York: Praeger), pp. xi, 20.
- 338 The full title is *The State and Revolution: The Marxist Theory of the State & the Tasks of the Proletariat in the Revolution*, written in August-September 1917 as Lenin was in hiding from the Provisional Government and mere weeks before he spearheaded the October Revolution. For a year at least, Lenin had argued the need for such a theoretical work applied to practical realities, and this was his major stab at providing one. See (among others) the introductory notes provided to *The State and Revolution* at www.marxists.org.
- 339 He stated this in his *Mater et Magistra, Encyclical on Christianity and Social Progress*, May 15, 1961.
- 340 Pope John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus*, May 1, 1991, posted at: https://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus.html.
- 341 See *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, nos. 1883-94; and David A. Bosnich, “The Principle of Subsidiarity,” *Religion & Liberty* (published by the Acton Institute), Vol. 6, No. 4, July 20, 2010.
- 342 See, for example, various congressmen using this in reference to Bella Dodd’s testimony during their exchange with Manning Johnson: Hearing Before the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, 83rd Congress, First Session, “Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area—Part 7 (Based on the Testimony of Manning Johnson),” July 13, 1953 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953), pp. 2202, 2216, 2217. See link posted at: <https://archive.org/details/investigationofcnyc0708unit/page/2202>.
- 343 Both were published by Circuit Riders, Inc., located in Cincinnati, Ohio.

- 344 Melish took up two pages, whereas his son, William Howard Melish (more on him in a moment), took up nine pages. Together, they filled pages 102-12 of the “20.5%/Episcopal” compilation.
- 345 In the 1920s, Roger Baldwin was very pro-Soviet, pro-communist, and worked closely with the Communist Party and its members, but didn’t join the party. The Hitler-Stalin Pact in 1939 was his wake-up call, as it was for many liberals. He began purging communists from the ACLU national board. After World War II, Baldwin became very anti-communist and even shared information with the FBI. He, too, is a remarkable story of political redemption when it came to communism.
- 346 See Kengor, *Dupes*, pp. 62-64, 188.
- 347 See Kengor, *Dupes*, pp. 62-64, 306-8.
- 348 In HUAC’s July 1953 report on communist activities in the New York City area, there are more references to Harry Ward than any other figure—twice as many as the next most-cited figure: Earl Browder. “Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area—Part 5,” Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, 83rd Congress, 1st Session, July 6, 1953 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1953), pp. 2284, 2291.
- 349 Alas, while Ward remained a dupe, there was a measure of redemption for Roger Baldwin. Baldwin eventually, after the Red Terror, after the Great Purge, after the Ukrainian famine, after the Hitler-Stalin Pact, after millions of rotting corpses, after the gulag, after the communists had violated every imaginable civil liberty, awakened to the stench of the Soviet system. He finally saw communism, and communists, as a genuine concern. By the early 1950s, Baldwin began insisting that ACLU officers take a non-communist oath. Call Baldwin crazy, but he figured that any ACLU member who held allegiance to “totalitarian dictatorship” was not truly serious about civil liberties. Perhaps they were publicly exploiting American civil liberties to privately support a nation (the USSR) that had no civil liberties? Yes, they were.
- 350 “Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States,” Special Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 78th Congress, Second Session, on H. Res. 282, App. Part IX, Vol. 1 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1944), p. 431.
- 351 William Z. Foster, *Toward Soviet America* (NY: International Publishers, 1932), pp. 272-73.
- 352 Among others, see the discussion in Paul Hollander, *Political Pilgrims* (NY: Harper & Row, 1983), p. 64.
- 353 See Jean Wagner, *Black poets of the United States: From Paul Laurence Dunbar to Langston Hughes* (Chicago and Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973), p. 435; and Faith Berry, *Langston Hughes: Before and Beyond Harlem* (NY: Citadel Press, 1992), pp. 296-97.
- 354 Email correspondence with Herb Romerstein, April 16, 2007 and June 23, 2007.
- 355 This exchange appears in “Investigation of Un-American Activities and Propaganda,” Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 75th Congress, House of Representatives, January 3, 1939, pp. 18-21. See posting at <https://archive.org/details/investigationofu1939unit/page/18>.
- 356 Martin (M.Y.) Latsis, the ferocious Latvian. In *The Red Terror in Russia*, published in Berlin in 1924, the Russian historian and socialist Sergei Melgunov cited Latsis, one of the first leaders of the Cheka, as giving this order to his thugs on November 1, 1918. This quote has been cited by a number of sources. Most recently, see Courtois, *Black Book*, p. 8. Among other sources that cite this quote, see Brown, *Doomsday 1917*, p. 173; and Leggett, *The Cheka*, pp. 463-68.
- 357 Earl Browder, *Report to the 8th Convention, Communist Party* (NY: Workers Library Publishers, 1934), p. 104.
- 358 “Conditions of Admission to the Communist International,” *Party Organizer*, February 1931, p. 31.

Quoted in “Structure and Function of Party Units,” *Party Organizer*, February 1931, p. 2. As
359 further evidence of such thinking, M. J. Olgin, communist and Browder colleague, said during
FDR’s first year in power, “The Communist Party of the U.S.A. is thus part of a worldwide
organization which gives it guidance and enhances its fighting power. Under the leadership of
the Communist Party the workers of the U.S.A. will proceed from struggle to struggle, from
victory to victory, until, rising in a revolution, they will crush the capitalist State, establish a
Soviet State, abolish the cruel and bloody system of capitalism and proceed to the upbuilding
of Socialism.” M. J. Olgin, *Why Communism?* (NY: Workers Library Publishers, 1933), p. 95.

360 Browder, *Communism in the United States*, p. 334.
361 Browder, *Communism in the United States*, p. 337.
362 Browder, *Communism in the United States*, p. 338.
363 I write about this at length throughout my book on Frank Marshall Davis. See Paul Kengor,
The Communist: Frank Marshall Davis, the Untold Story of Barack Obama’s Mentor (New
York: Mercury Ink, Simon & Schuster, 2012), pp. 34-44.

364 Browder, *Communism in the United States*, pp. 294, 349.
365 Browder, *Communism in the United States*, p. 336.
366 Browder, *Communism in the United States*, p. 337.
367 Herb Romerstein and Eric Breindel, *The Venona Secrets* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2000),
pp. 412-13.
368 Romerstein and Breindel, *The Venona Secrets*, p. 413.
369 See “Pacelli Lunches With Roosevelt,” *New York Times*, November 6, 1936; and Kengor, *A
Pope and President*, pp. 54-56.

370 See Charles R. Gallagher, *Vatican Secret Diplomacy: Joseph P. Hurley and Pope Pius XII*
(New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 87-88.
371 See the foreword to the 2018 paperback edition of my book, *Dupes*, as well as other chapters in
the book on FDR.

372 For the record, *Divini Redemptoris* was released in March 1937, though it was merely the latest
in a long line of anti-communist statements from the Vatican dating back to at least 1846.

373 Romerstein and Breindel, *The Venona Secrets*, pp. 412-13.
374 “Browder Offers Aid to Catholics,” *The New York Times*, May 29, 1938.
375 Earl Browder, *A Message to Catholics* (New York: Workers Library Publishers, 1938).
Document is available online at: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/browder/message-catholics.pdf>.

376 This is widely understood by anyone who belonged in or has studied the Comintern and
international communist movement. For a quick summary, see Kengor, *Dupes*, pp. 20-33.

377 Robert Service, *The End of the Cold War: 1985-1991* (NY: Public Affairs, 2015), pp. 95-98.
378 Browder, *A Message to Catholics*, p. 3.
379 See Celie and Albert Vassart, “The Moscow Origin of the French ‘Popular Front,’” in Milorad
M. Drachkovitch and Branko Lazitch, eds., *The Comintern: Historical Highlights—Essays,
Recollections, Documents* (New York: Praeger), pp. 112 and 234-52.

380 Celie and Albert Vassart, “The Moscow Origin of the French ‘Popular Front,’” pp. 246-47,
257, 311.
381 Celie and Albert Vassart, “The Moscow Origin of the French ‘Popular Front,’” pp. 251-52.
382 Celie and Albert Vassart, “The Moscow Origin of the French ‘Popular Front,’” pp. 235-36.
383 See Kengor, *Dupes*, pp. 160-81.
384 Browder, *A Message to Catholics*, p. 3.
385 Browder, *A Message to Catholics*, p. 7.

386 See Shawn Ritenour, *Foundations of Economics: A Christian View* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2015).

387 Browder, *A Message to Catholics*, p. 7.

388 Browder, *A Message to Catholics*, p. 8.

389 Browder, *A Message to Catholics*, p. 8.

390 For an in-depth examination, see Paul Kengor, *Takedown: From Communists to Progressives, How the Left Has Sabotaged Family and Marriage* (Washington, DC: WND Books, 2015).

391 Browder, *A Message to Catholics*, p. 15.

392 “Catholics Reject Communist Plea,” *The New York Times*, July 31, 1938.

393 Fulton J. Sheen, *Communism Answers Questions of a Communist* (New York: The Paulist Press, 1937).

394 Sheen’s most powerful exposition on the communist war on the family appears in chapter seven of his 1948 work, *Communism and the Conscience of the West*.

395 Sheen, *Communism Answers Questions of a Communist*, p. 33.

396 See discussion in Kengor, *A Pope and a President*, pp. 72-73, 82-83.

397 Sheen, *Communism Answers Questions of a Communist*, pp. 34-35.

398 Sheen, *Communism Answers Questions of a Communist*, pp. 38-39.

399 “Open Letter to Browder By Editors,” *The Catholic Worker*, Vol. VI, No. 4, September 1938, pp. 1-2.

400 See discussion in Paul Kengor and Robert Orlando, *The Divine Plan: Ronald Reagan, John Paul II, and the Dramatic End of the Cold War* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2019), pp. 40-47.

401 See J. B. Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler* (New York: Mount Vernon Publishers, 1938).

402 Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, pp. 59-64.

403 John R. Erickson, “A disappointed man,” *WORLD Magazine*, November 7, 2015.

404 We see here with the likes of Thomas a crucial difference between socialists of old and those of today: the ones of old were oftentimes religious, whereas those of today are often secular and anti-religious. One continuing thread, however, is the Religious Left: there have long been religious leftists in American history. They have long carried the banner of “social justice,” arguing in particular for heavy levels of wealth redistribution.

405 Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 96.

406 Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 115.

407 See the numerous examples throughout Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*.

408 Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, pp. 9-10. Matthews here cites Earl Browder, *Communism in the United States* (New York: International Publishers, September 1935), p. 335.

409 Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 9. Matthews cites Browder, *Communism in the United States*, p. 55.

410 Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 9. Matthews quotes from D. Z. Manuilsky, *The Work of the Seventh Congress*.

411 Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 208.

412 Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, pp. 208-9. Here Matthews cited the *Daily Worker*, February 9, 1938.

413 Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 209. Here Matthews cited Bennett Stevens, *The Church and the Workers*, p. 31.

414 Once again: Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 209—citing Bennett Stevens, *The Church and the Workers*, p. 31.

Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 209. Here Matthews cited Corliss Lamont, *Soviet Russia and Religion*, p. 21f.

Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 209. Here Matthews cited Corliss Lamont, *Soviet Russia and Religion*, p. 19.

See Kengor, *Dupes*, pp. 68-79.

Matthews here was quoting from general (unnamed) communist literature. Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 210.

Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 211. Here Matthews cited the *Daily Worker*, January 14, 1938, p. 6.

Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 211. Here Matthews cited editions of the *Daily Worker* from January 21, 1938, January 24, 1938, and February 16, 1938.

Matthews, *Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler*, p. 212.

See Reeves, *America's Bishop: The Life and Times of Fulton J. Sheen*, pp. 170-73.

Testimony of Louis Francis Budenz, Hearing Before the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, 79th Congress, Second Session, "Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities," November 22, 1946 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1946), pp. 1-2, 31-33. See link posted at <https://archive.org/details/investigationofu1946unit/page/n5>.

Budenz's testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities came on November 22, 1946. The key part of his testimony excerpted here from the official transcript runs from the bottom of page 31 to the middle of page 33.

Benjamin Gitlow, *I Confess: The Truth About American Communism* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1940); and Benjamin Gitlow, *The Whole of Their Lives* (New York: Scribner's, 1948).

Gitlow wrote, "Not only does the Communist Party member give every moment of his time to the cause but every dollar he can spare as well, often giving much more than he can afford." Gitlow, *I Confess*, 289.

This document is in the Comintern Archives on CPUSA, Fond 515, Opis 1, Delo 4084. See also Romerstein and Breindel, *The Venona Secrets*, 20-21.

"Testimony of Benjamin Gitlow," Hearing Before the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, 83rd Congress, First Session, "Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area—Part 6," July 7, 1953 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953), pp. 2145-79. Gitlow's testimony runs from pages 2069-2136. The key material on Ward and his Methodist Federation for Social Action is on pages 2074-95. What follows is excerpted from those pages. See link posted at: <https://archive.org/details/investigationofc0506unit/page/2032>.

"Testimony of Benjamin Gitlow," Hearing Before the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, July 7, 1953, pp. 2072-73.

See Camille M. Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the Kremlin* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1950), pp. 62-63. Cianfarra also wrote the 1944 book *The Vatican and the War*. He died tragically on July 25, 1956 during a collision of two large passenger ships off the coast of Nantucket (en route from Spain). The tragedy killed two of his children as well.

"Testimony of Benjamin Gitlow," Hearing Before the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, July 7, 1953, pp. 2077-78.

The Profintern, which existed from 1921 to 1937, was formally known as the Red International of Labor Unions. The name was a contraction derived from the Russian "Professionalnye Soyuz Internationalnye." See <https://www.marxists.org/history/international/profintern/index.htm>.

The term "agitprop" is a contraction that refers to agitation and propaganda. The Soviets ran an actual Department of Agitprop.

- 434 See Paul Kengor, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Communism* (Washington, DC: Regnery, 2017), pp. 287-97; and Kengor, *The Communist*, pp. 37-41.
- 435 The information in this section comes from chapter one of Manning Johnson's *Color, Communism and Common Sense*.
- 436 Hearing Before the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, 83rd Congress, First Session, "Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area—Part 7 (Based on the Testimony of Manning Johnson)," July 8, 1953 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953), pp. 2145-79. See link posted at <https://archive.org/details/investigationofcnyc0708unit/page/n3>.
- 437 I have encountered several Catholic authors who took the liberty of inserting the word "Catholic" and inaccurately creating an uppercase C for "Church" in Manning Johnson's testimony. These authors quote the testimony this way: "the Communists discovered that the destruction of religion could proceed much faster through infiltration of the [Catholic] Church by Communists operating within the Church itself." (See, for example, Taylor Marshall in his 2019 book with Sophia Institute Press, *Infiltration: The Plot to Destroy the Church from Within*, p. 86.) That is an inaccurate rendering. It is not how the original testimony of Manning Johnson reads, was printed, or was intended. In the official transcript printed by Congress's Government Printing Office, it reads this way: "the Communists discovered that the destruction of religion could proceed much faster through infiltration of the church by Communists operating within the church itself." The mistake is probably an honest one by Catholics who assume that "church" means "Catholic Church," or who simply have cited the mis-rendering by others.
- 438 Note: Manning Johnson is probably here referring to William Montgomery Brown's book, *My Heresy: The Autobiography of an Idea*. Johnson can be forgiven for referring to it strictly as *Heresy*.
- 439 See article posted at <https://www.marxists.org/history/usa/pubs/communist/v18n08-aug-1939-The-Communist-OCR.pdf>. The Communist would change its name to *Political Affairs*, the longtime title of what was known as "the theoretical journal" of Communist Party USA. <https://www.marxists.org/history/usa/pubs/communist/index.htm>.
- 440 Hearing Before the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, 83rd Congress, First Session, "Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area—Part 7 (Based on the Testimony of Manning Johnson)," July 13, 1953 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953), pp. 2202-3. See link posted at <https://archive.org/details/investigationofcnyc0708unit/page/2202>.
- 441 Bella V. Dodd, *School of Darkness* (NY: Devin-Adair, 1954), pp. 3, 33-35, 39-41, 42-43. On George Counts' Moscow pilgrimage with John Dewey, see Kengor, *Dupes*, pp. 66, 102.
- 442 Dodd, *School of Darkness*, pp. 47, 60, 159.
- 443 Bella Dodd, *School of Darkness*, p. 214.
- 444 Whittaker Chambers, *Witness* (New York: Random House, 1952), pp. 242, 264.
- 445 Bella Dodd, *School of Darkness*, p. 150.
- 446 This speech by Bella Dodd can be listened to online. Click the following link and go to the 1:09:35 marker for this particular passage: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=37HgRWTsGs0>.
- 447 Again, see the very revealing book by CPUSA head William Z. Foster, *Toward Soviet America*.
- 448 This quote is well-established. For a current source who documents it nicely, see Barry Popkin, who, among other bona fides, is a contributor to the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Popkin at his website lists at least a half-dozen contemporaneous books (all by reputable, leading publishers of their day, such as MacMillan and Viking) with very similar variations of the quote, including Harry Greenwall's *Mirrors of Moscow* (1929), Bruce Hopper's *What Russia Intends*

(1931), Margaret (Reibold) Craig-McKerrow's *The Iron Road to Samarcand* (1932), Thomas Woody's *New Minds: New Men?* (1932), and Walter Duranty's *Duranty Reports Russia* (1934). Duranty, of course, was the Pulitzer Prize-winning (and infamous) *New York Times* correspondent on Moscow. Duranty reported the Lenin quotation this way: "Give me four years to teach the children, and the seed I shall have sown will never be uprooted" (page 175 of his book).

http://www.barrypopik.com/index.php/new_york_city/entry/give_me_four_years_to_teach_the_children. In addition to Popkin, also see S. Doniger, "Soviet Education and Children's Literature," *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, vol. 8, no. 3, 1934, pp. 162-67.

449 On Dodd at *New Masses*, see "Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States," Special Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 78th Congress, Second Session, on H. Res. 282, App. Part IX, Vol. 3 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1944), also known simply as "Appendix IX," pp. 1350-52 and 1453.

450 See "Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States," Special Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 78th Congress, Second Session, on H. Res. 282, App. Part IX, Vols. 1, 2, and 3 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1944), also known simply as "Appendix IX," pp. 433, 443, 446, 449, 1366, 1632, 1672, 1771, 1778.

451 Sheen also brought back to the faith Louis Budenz, bringing the *Daily Worker* editor—whose name at the time of his reversion was still on the masthead—into the Church along with his wife and three daughters. Thomas C. Reeves, *America's Bishop: The Life and Times of Fulton J. Sheen* (Encounter Books, 2001), pp. 170-73.

452 Bella Dodd, *School of Darkness* (New York: 1954), pp. 230-31.

453 Dodd, *School of Darkness*, pp. 231-37; and Fulton J. Sheen, *Treasure in Clay* (New York: Doubleday, 1980), p. 263.

454 Bella Dodd, *School of Darkness* (New York: 1954), pp. 231-33.

455 Dodd, *School of Darkness*, p. 237.

456 Dodd, *School of Darkness*, pp. 240-45.

457 Merely Googling or checking YouTube for the source of Bella's assertion is fruitless. Posted audio claiming that she spoke of 1,000 or 1,100 or 1,200 men in seminaries in her memoir, before Congress, in a speech at Fordham, in a speech at Utica, fails every time to produce the exact line from the memoir, from her congressional testimony, from her speeches at Fordham or in Utica. Documentaries quoting her giving the number do not actually produce the precise where and when. Online sources will run audio of a Bella Dodd speech and then stop it and over-lay the alleged quote about seminaries, without citing its provenance. It is a frustrating endeavor. Nonetheless, it appears that she did say it, albeit not in any of those venues.

458 See "Bella Dodd, Former Red, Dies," *Washington Post*, May 1, 1969; and "Dr. Bella V. Dodd Dies at 64," *The New York Times*, April 30, 1969.

459 The Honorable John R. Rarick, *The Congressional Record—Extensions of Remarks*, May 15, 1969, p. E4036.

460 I filed the FOIA via an attorney friend and colleague who deals with FOIAs on a day-to-day basis. He likewise has been surprised at the lack of progress on this particular request.

461 The lack of response could well be the usual inefficiency of the federal bureaucracy. I do not know how many others have filed FOIAs for Bella Dodd's file. It would, however, be a big surprise if I were the first and only to submit a FOIA request for her FBI file. The federal government has acknowledged the request, but the file still has not been released.

462 Hildebrand seems to have used phrases like "approximately 1,200" and "some 1,100."

463 As recently as a May 7, 2019 email exchange, Mary Nicholas told me again: "In terms of something Bella said in writings, the answer remains no."

- 464 Email correspondence with Mary Nicholas, September 7, 2018. Though I have read Mary's manuscript, I attempted first to write this chapter without her notes (about six months had passed since I had last looked at the notes), constructing my own narrative first, and only then going back to her account for what I might have missed. I did this so as not to duplicate her work and to see if I could come to similar conclusions prior to revisiting her case. I do disagree with her citing of Manning Johnson. Overall, however, I do not dispute her conclusions.
- 465 "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda," A Study Presented by the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 86th Congress, Second Session (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 7. See link posted at <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uiug.30112039644817;view=1up;seq=3>.
- 466 I noted earlier how Pol Pot and his Khmer Rouge were a product of European universities, specifically in France. This particular report, issued in 1960, a decade and a half before Pot and his genocidal thugs took power in Cambodia (in 1975), prophetically stated, "European universities are so contaminated [by Marxist propaganda] that the Communist and para-Communist movements of Asia and Africa can be said to have been nurtured in them." "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda," Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, p. 7.
- 467 "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda," Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, p. 8.
- 468 "Exclusive Interview with Alice von Hildebrand," Michael Voris, Church-Militant.com, January 28, 2016, posted on YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CKLBvvlbgw>.
- 469 "Present at the Demolition," an interview with Dr. Alice von Hildebrand, *The Latin Mass Magazine*, summer 2001, posted at http://www.latinmassmagazine.com/articles/articles_2001_su_hildebran.html.
- 470 Dodd, *School of Darkness*, pp. 83, 93-94.
- 471 Dodd, *School of Darkness*, p. 130.
- 472 Dodd, *School of Darkness*, p. 94.
- 473 This document was an inter-office "Office Memorandum: United States Government," basically an official internal FBI document, written by J. P. Coyne to "Mr. Ladd," who was D. M. Ladd. Both were high-level government officials. Ladd was the FBI's assistant director.
- 474 This data comes from the Official Catholic Directory and was provided by the Rev. Donald Paul Sullins, M.Div., Ph.D., Research Associate Professor of Sociology at the Catholic University of America in emails April 14-15, 2019. I am very grateful to Dr. Sullins for his assistance.
- Still today, after decades of steady, precipitous decline, there are some 37,000 priests in the United States (and about 5,000 current seminarians), down from roughly 60,000 in 1970. According to the US Conference of Catholic Bishops, in 2018 there were 37,302 priests and 4,856 seminarians. See <http://www.usccb.org/about/public-affairs/backgrounders/clergy-religious.cfm>. On statistics, since 1970, when there were 59,192 total priests, see the data maintained by Georgetown's Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate: <http://cara.georgetown.edu/frequently-requested-church-statistics/>.
- 475 Email from Dr. Paul Sullins, April 15, 2019.
- 476 Dodd, *School of Darkness*, p. 85.
- 477 Dodd, *School of Darkness*, pp. 78-83.
- 478 Dodd, *School of Darkness*, pp. 86-90.
- 479 Reeves, *America's Bishop*, pp. 86-87.
- 480 Also in the *New York Times* of April 28, 1952 was a shorter accompanying article, titled "Sheen Leaves for Paris: Sheen Says Reds Had Church Spies," reported by United Press, also on page 1 of the newspaper. It noted that Father Alighiero Tondi "had left the [Jesuit] order and

has become a Communist. Such actions involve automatic excommunication.” The piece noted that Tondi “had been a Jesuit for sixteen years” prior to “his conversion to communism,” which he outlined in a lengthy article in the pro-communist Italian newspaper *Il Paese*.

- 481 Michael H. Crosby, *Thank God Ahead of Time: The Life and Spirituality of Solanus Casey* (Cincinnati, OH: Franciscan Media, 2009), p. 1.
- 482 Crosby, *Thank God Ahead of Time: The Life and Spirituality of Solanus Casey*, p. 192.
- 483 See Kengor, Dupes, pp. 226-27. That book includes each five-digit Communist Party USA membership number of each of the Hollywood Ten, as do other books, such as Allan Ryskind’s excellent 2015 work, *Hollywood Traitors: Blacklisted Screenwriters—Agents of Stalin, Allies of Hitler* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery). For a quick reference, see my April 2015 review of Ryskind’s book posted online at the website of the Institute for Faith & Freedom, <https://www.faithandfreedom.com/hollywoods-blacklist-and-agents-of-stalin-and-hitler/>.
- 484 Letter published in Crosby, *Thank God Ahead of Time: The Life and Spirituality of Solanus Casey*, p. 193.
- 485 The introduction to the “658/NCC” compilation report (written by M. G. Lowman) was careful to caution: “The reader of these records of leftist affiliations should guard with the utmost care against the assumption that these men and women of the National Council of Churches are Communists, Communist sympathizers, or Communist Party members. Any such assumption should be avoided with respect to the group of 658 as a whole and with respect to any individual member of the group.” That is a fair warning. Even then, there is no question that some if not many of the 658 were communists.
- 486 The audio of this speech is posted online, albeit not reliably sourced. It is, however, indisputably Dodd. As the details of the speech reveal, it was given in New York State, and after her baptism under Sheen and after her 1953 Senate testimony. References are also made to McCarthy, who is spoken of in present tense. (He died in 1957.) The speech would thus have taken place sometime between 1953 and 1957. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=37HgRWTsGs0>.
- 487 Elisabeth Braw, *God’s Spies: The Stasi’s Cold War Espionage Operation Inside the Church* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2019).
- 488 Elisabeth Braw interviewed on “Kresta in the Afternoon,” Ave Maria Radio Network, September 16, 2019.
- 489 Braw on “Kresta in the Afternoon.”
- 490 Braw on “Kresta in the Afternoon.”
- 491 John Koehler, *Spies in the Vatican: The Soviet Union’s Cold War Against the Catholic Church* (New York: Pegasus Books, 2009).
- 492 Koehler, *Spies in the Vatican*, pp. 153-54.
- 493 Koehler, *Spies in the Vatican*, pp. 136-51.
- 494 See my extended analysis throughout Kengor, *A Pope and a President*.
- 495 See Kengor, *A Pope and a President*, pp. 151-55.
- 496 Koehler, *Spies in the Vatican*, pp. 9, 15, 169.
- 497 See our interview with Allen in Paul Kengor and Robert Orlando, *The Divine Plan: John Paul II, Ronald Reagan, and the Dramatic End of the Cold War* (Wilmington, Delaware: ISI Books, 2019), pp. 104-5.
- 498 Koehler, *Spies in the Vatican*, pp. 87-88. Also see *A Pope and a President*, which deals with the November 13, 1979 meeting and the implications more than any other recent book.
- 499 George Weigel, for instance, questions whether the edict was an on-the-record order for assassination. Robert Orlando and I discuss this, including the pros and cons, at length in our book *The Divine Plan*.

I cannot affirm the accuracy of these reports. Thus, I note that the priest has been accused and
500 alleged and reported to have engaged in such things. See George Weigel, *The End and the Beginning* (New York: Image, 2011), pp. 110-11.
See “Vatican Informers Spied on Pope John Paul II,” *National Catholic Register*, September
501 17-23, 2006.
502 My edition is the 1991 edition published by TAN Books.
503 My edition is the version translated from Italian by Ian Martin and published by Key Porter Books in Toronto in the year 2000. The original 1999 was published in Italy by Kaos Editions (*Kaos Edizioni*, located in Milan) in February 1999.
504 The Millenari, *Shroud of Secrecy*, pp. 168-70.
505 The Millenari, *Shroud of Secrecy*, p. 167.
506 The Millenari, *Shroud of Secrecy*, pp. 167-71.
507 The Millenari, *Shroud of Secrecy*, p. 171.
508 Camille M. Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the Kremlin* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1950), pp. 66-67. See Cianfarra’s examples of persecution on pages 49-56, among others.
509 Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the Kremlin*, pp. 68-69.
510 For a summary of the origins of the communists’ reprehensible smear “Hitler’s Pope,” see chapter 7 of my *A Pope and a President*, which, among others, cites the important work of scholar Ron Rychlak as well as the other recent literature on the subject.
511 Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the Kremlin*, pp. 72-73.
512 Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the Kremlin*, pp. 74-80.
513 Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the Kremlin*, pp. 115-16.
514 Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the Kremlin*, p. 28.
515 I interviewed Rusak on April 21, 2017 at Grove City College in Grove City, Pennsylvania.
516 Hannah Brockhaus, “Pope in Romania: Martyred bishops gave their lives for fidelity to the Church,” *Catholic News Agency*, June 2, 2019.
517 “Pope warns of divisive ideologies in homage to communist-era martyrs,” Reuters, June 2, 2019.
518 Pope Paul VI said this in a June 29, 1972 homily. Also see Paul VI’s 1972 encyclical, “Confronting the Devil’s Power,” posted at <https://www.papalencyclicals.net/paul06/p6devil.htm>.
519 Dean Dettloff, “The Catholic Case for Communism,” *America Magazine*, July 23, 2019. Also on the Jesuits, see Malachi Martin, *The Jesuits: The Society of Jesus and the Betrayal of the Roman Catholic Church* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987).
520 “Former Soviet spy: We created Liberation Theology,” *Catholic News Agency*, May 1, 2015, posted at <https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/former-soviet-spy-we-created-liberation-theology-83634>.
521 Email correspondence with Stephen Schwartz, June 11, 2018.
522 See Stephen’s description, “Why I Chose Islam Instead of Judaism,” Jewcy. com, February 19, 2007, posted at http://jewcy.com/post/why_i_chose_islam_instead_judaism.
523 On Herb and Bettina Aptheker, see my discussion in *Dupes*, pp. 306-11.
524 Bettina Aptheker has written openly about her father sexually abusing her. See Bettina Aptheker, ““Did I ever hurt you when you were a child?”” *Los Angeles Times*, October 15, 2006.
525 I have written about the members of the Weathermen and Weather Underground (particularly Mark Rudd, Bill Ayers, and Bernardine Dohrn, among others) at great length in my books *Dupes* and *Takedown*, with the latter focused on the sexual-moral views and practices of this

sordid gang of Marxist-progressive revolutionaries. I recommend those treatments for readers not faint of heart.

- 526 Email correspondence with Stephen Schwartz, June 11, 2018.
- 527 John Symonds, *The Great Beast: The life and magick of Aleister Crowley* (London: Macdonald and Co., 1971).
- 528 See the definitive work Asbjorn Dyrendal, "Satan and the Beast: The Influence of Aleister Crowley on Modern Satanism," in Henrik Bogdan and Martin P. Starr, eds., *Aleister Crowley and Western Esotericism* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2012).
- 529 John Preston, "Aleister Crowley: The Biography by Tobias Churton: review," *The Telegraph*, September 7, 2011.
- 530 See Marco Pasi, *Aleister Crowley and the Temptation of Politics* (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), pp. 52-53, 73-77.
- 531 Walter Duranty, "Russians Hungry, but Not Starving," *New York Times*, March 31, 1933, p. 13.
- 532 See Douglas McCollam, "Should This Pulitzer Be Pulled?" *Columbia Journalism Review*, November/December 2003; Robert Conquest, *The Harvest of Sorrow* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 308-9; S. J. Taylor, *Stalin's Apologist* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 205; and Mark Levin, *Unfreedom of the Press* (New York: Threshold Editions, Simon & Schuster), pp. 166-70.
- 533 Douglas McCollam, "Should This Pulitzer be Pulled?" *Columbia Journalism Review*, November/December 2003.
- 534 S. J. Taylor, *Stalin's Apologist: Walter Duranty: The New York Times's Man in Moscow* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 35-37.
- 535 The following account comes from S. J. Taylor, *Stalin's Apologist*, pp. 29-37.
- 536 Presumably Taylor meant to imply that both men were bisexual. They both had sexual relations with women and, it certainly seems, engaged in some sort of physical if not sexual relations with men and with each other.
- 537 Taylor, *Stalin's Apologist*, pp. 36-37.
- 538 Stuart Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay: Founder of the Modern Gay Movement* (White Crane Books, 2012).
- 539 Will Roscoe, ed., *Radically Gay: Gay Liberation in the Words of Its Founder* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996).
- 540 Roscoe, *Radically Gay*, p. 5.
- 541 Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 169.
- 542 For instance, the Wikipedia entry on Obama's mentor, Frank Marshall Davis, is sugarcoated beyond any semblance of accuracy when it comes to Davis's communist activism. It is plainly outrageous and mendacious in its whitewashing of his CPUSA membership and overall intense communist commitment, neither of which typically are even mentioned there.
- 543 Wikipedia entry retrieved July 1, 2016.
- 544 This is widely known. The Wikipedia entry for NAMBLA accurately describes the group as "a pedophilia and pederasty advocacy organization in the United States" that "works to abolish age-of-consent laws criminalizing adult sexual involvement with minors." See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_American_Man/Boy_Love_Association, retrieved July 20, 2019.
- 545 Even Wikipedia, which often censors this kind of material regarding leftists it likes, includes all of these facts on Thorstad. They are included in Wikipedia entry for David Thorstad and they are also included in the Wikipedia entry for NAMBLA, which lists Thorstad as the group's founder. Wikipedia entry retrieved (again) on May 8, 2020, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_American_Man/Boy_Love_Association.

See David Thorstad, “Why I’m Skipping Stonewall 50,” *CounterPunch*, June 21, 2019, posted at <https://www.counterpunch.org/2019/06/21/why-imskipping-stonewall-50/>; and Matt C. Abbott, “Admitted pederast accuses me of spreading a lie,” *Renew America*, August 12, 2010, posted at <http://www.renewamerica.com/columns/abbott/100812>.

See Roscoe, *Radically Gay*, pp. 302-10.

Roscoe, *Radically Gay*, pp. 302-10 and 363.

Wikipedia entry retrieved May 8, 2020, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry_Hay.

Website of the Radical Faeries, retrieved June 29, 2016. <http://www.radfae.org/>.

Leslie Feinberg, “Hay studies ancient history, finds pride,” *Workers World*, July 14, 2005. <http://www.workers.org/2005/us/lavender-red-42/>.

See Peter Hasson, “New York City Lets You Choose From 31 Different Gender Identities,” *The Daily Caller*, May 24, 2016. The list of gender options is posted online by the New York City Commission on Human Rights: http://www.nyc.gov/html/cchr/downloads/pdf/publications/GenderID_Card2015.pdf.

This was widely reported. See, among others, “BBC films teaches children of ‘100 genders, or more,’” *The London Times*, September 8, 2019, posted at <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/bbc-films-teach-children-of-100-genders-or-more-7xfhbg97p>.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, pp. 282-83.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 304.

See my section, “Watermelons and climate communists,” in Kengor, *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Communism*, pp. 262-63.

Hay wrote this on July 5, 1980. See Roscoe, *Radically Gay*, pp. 254-64.

I do not know how long Harry did this, but he did so at least in the year 1935, perhaps give or take a few years before or after. See Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, pp. 83-84; and Will Roscoe, *Radically Gay*, p. 356.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, pp. 83-84.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 84.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 84.

Stuart Timmons does not give the first name of Father Follen, and I was unable to definitively identify it.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 70.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 75.

Roscoe, *Radically Gay*, p. 356; and Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 72.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 72-76.

Roscoe, *Radically Gay*, p. 357; and Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 141.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 323.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 76.

See Sam Tanenhaus, *Whittaker Chambers: A Biography* (NY: Random House, 1997), pp. 56-67.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 108.

Recall the earlier citation of the March 2, 1948 FBI document reporting that “almost 50% of the Communist Party members in the United States are located in the New York area.”

Roscoe, *Radically Gay*, p. 39; and Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, pp. 134-35.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, pp. 115-16.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, pp. 178, 206.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, pp. 205-7.

Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, pp. 121 and 178.

- 578 John Barron, *KGB: The Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agents* (NY: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1974), pp. 206-7.
- 579 Different sources and scholars place different dates on this, some saying 1950, and others saying 1951. Roscoe says that Hay resigned from CPUSA in 1951 after having joined the Party in 1934, and that Mattachine was officially formed in 1951. Timmons, to the contrary, says that Mattachine was founded in 1950. See Roscoe, *Radically Gay*, pp. 37-8, 358-59; and Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. xx.
- 580 Harry and gang referred to themselves as “us progressives.” These men initially came together through the Progressive Party presidential bid of Henry Wallace in 1948, which was a rallying point for American communists. Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, pp. 150-53.
- 581 Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, p. 108.
- 582 Stephen Schwartz told me, “Harry Hay was a Stalinist to the end. I know this from an unimpeachable source.” Email from Schwartz, June 14, 2018.
- 583 Zoltan Tarr, *The Frankfurt School: The Critical Theories of Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2011), p. 2.
- 584 The two best scholarly books on the Frankfurt School and its history are Rolf Wiggershaus’s *The Frankfurt School*, published in 1994 by MIT Press (nearly 800 pages in length, with translations of German writings that no other scholar in English has published), and Martin Jay’s *The Dialectical Imagination*, published in 1996 by the University of California Press.
- 585 Wilhelm Reich, *The Passion of Youth: An Autobiography, 1897-1922* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1988), pp. 4-5, 9. The book was published posthumously and was edited by Mary Boyd Higgins and Chester M. Raphael.
- 586 Reich, *The Passion of Youth: An Autobiography, 1897-1922*, p. 6.
- 587 Reich, *The Passion of Youth: An Autobiography, 1897-1922*, p. 13.
- 588 Reich, *The Passion of Youth: An Autobiography, 1897-1922*, p. 25.
- 589 Reich, *The Passion of Youth: An Autobiography, 1897-1922*, pp. 21-22.
- 590 See entry at <http://www.marxists.org/glossary/people/r/e.htm#reich-wilhelm>.
- 591 Ariel Levy, “Novelty Acts,” *The New Yorker*, September 19, 2011. Another source who merits this title is arguably Alfred Kinsey, whose sexual anarchism was possibly to the left of even Reich.
- 592 I will here quote from the 1974 edition, translated by Therese Pol and published by Farrar, Straus, and Giroux. Full citation: Wilhelm Reich, *The Sexual Revolution: Toward a Self-Regulating Character Structure* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1974). This book starts with prefaces from the second edition (1936), third edition (1945), and fourth edition (1949).
- 593 See informational post at the Wilhelm Reich Trust website, http://www.wilhelmreichtrust.org/sexual_revolution.html, retrieved July 19, 2019.
- 594 Reich noted in the fourth edition that the book was “virtually unchanged” from the first edition.
- 595 Reich, *The Sexual Revolution*, pp. xi-xiv.
- 596 Reich, *The Sexual Revolution*, pp. xvi-xvii.
- 597 These statements come from the preface to the 1936 edition of the book in German, written by Reich in November 1935. See Reich, *The Sexual Revolution*, pp. xxvi-xxviii and xxx.
- 598 He wrote this in the preface to the third edition, in 1945: Reich, *The Sexual Revolution*, pp. xv-xvi.
- 599 The best and most extended analysis of this is: W. Edward Mann and Edward Hoffman, *The Man Who Dreamed of Tomorrow: A Conceptual Biography of Wilhelm Reich* (Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher, 1980), which includes a foreword by Reich’s daughter, Eva Reich. See especially pages 182-97.

- See the discussion by Myron Sharaf, *Fury on Earth: A Biography of Wilhelm Reich* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), pp. 396-97.
- Mann and Hoffman, *The Man Who Dreamed of Tomorrow: A Conceptual Biography of Wilhelm Reich*, pp. 191-92, 194.
- See Mann and Hoffman, *The Man Who Dreamed of Tomorrow: A Conceptual Biography of Wilhelm Reich*, pp. 188.
- See chapter 12, "The Future of an Illusion," in Ben Wiker, *10 Books That Screwed Up the World* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2008), pp. 165-76.
- Mann and Hoffman, *The Man Who Dreamed of Tomorrow: A Conceptual Biography of Wilhelm Reich*, pp. 182-85.
- Mann and Hoffman, *The Man Who Dreamed of Tomorrow: A Conceptual Biography of Wilhelm Reich*, pp. 186-87.
- Berlin in this period was a haunt of every sort of demon. The licentiousness, the immorality, the culture was wicked. It is no surprise the creatures that emerged from this milieu in the first half of the twentieth century. Ralph de Toledano would describe it as a kind of "European Babylon."
- On the financing of the Frankfurt School move, see Toledano, *Cry Havoc!*, pp. 78-83.
- See posting at: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/benjamin/1940/history.htm>.
- Kam Shapiro, "Walter Benjamin, the Kabbalah, and Secularism," *AJS Perspectives: The Magazine for the Association for Jewish Studies*, Spring 2011.
- Eric Jacobson, "Metaphysics of the Profane: The Political Theology of Walter Benjamin and Gershom Scholem" (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), p. 245, n67.
- Donna Roberts and Daniel Garza Usabiaga, *The Use of Lucifer: A Comparative Analysis of the Figures of Lucifer and Satan in the Writings of Roger Caillois and Walter Benjamin*. http://www.academia.edu/6014358/The_Use_Value_of_Lucifer_A_Comparative_Analysis_of_the_Figures_of_Lucifer_and_Satan_in_the_Writings_of_Roger_Caillois_and_Walter_Benjamin_in_the_1930s Accessed: 11/14/2016.
- Roberts and Usabiaga, *The Use of Lucifer*.
- Roberts and Usabiaga, *The Use of Lucifer*, p. 1.
- Roberts and Usabiaga, *The Use of Lucifer*, p. 1.
- Roberts and Usabiaga, *The Use of Lucifer*, p. 2.
- Ray Man, "Monument a D.A.F. de Sade (1933)," *Art Stack: The World's favorite art*. <https://theartstack.com/artist/man-ray/monument-a-d-f-de-sa> accessed: 11/12/2016
- Ernst, Max, "The Blessed Virgin Chastises the Infant Jesus Before Three Witnesses (1926)" *artnet* http://www.artnet.com/magazineus/features/kachur/kachur7-21-05_detail.asp?picnum=2 accessed: 11/12/2016
- Roberts and Usabiaga, *The Use of Lucifer*, p. 5.
- Benjamin's interest in aesthetics and art criticism permeated throughout his works. This more esoteric, non-analytical approach to philosophy is characteristic of Benjamin's work.
- See, among others, David Biale, *Gershom Scholem: Kabbalah and Counter-History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), pp. 136-38 and n94; and Roberts and Usabiaga, *The Use of Lucifer*, p. 6.
- Roberts and Usabiaga, *The Use of Lucifer*, pp. 5-7.
- Roberts and Usabiaga, *The Use of Lucifer*, pp. 10-11.
- Roberts and Usabiaga, *The Use of Lucifer*, pp. 6-7.
- See Otto Karl Werckmeister, *Icons of the Left: Benjamin and Einstein, Picasso and Kafka After the Fall* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), p. 9.

625 Church of Satan's official website, F.A.Q. Fundamental Beliefs, <http://www.churchofsatan.com/faq-fundamental-beliefs.php>, accessed: 11/12/2016

626 As cited earlier, see posting at: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/oct/02.htm>.

627 Ibid.

628 Max Horkheimer, *Critical Theory* (New York: Seabury Press, 1982), p. 244.

629 For an extended discussion of the term "cultural Marxism" and how the very term itself is misunderstood today, see my piece: Paul Kengor, "Cultural Marxism and Its Conspirators," *The American Spectator*, April 3, 2019, posted at <https://spectator.org/cultural-marxism-and-its-conspirators/>.

630 This definition appeared throughout 2019 as I checked several times during the writing of this book.

631 Jason A. Josephson-Storm, *The Myth of Disenchantment: Magic, Modernity, and the Birth of Human Sciences* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017), pp. 209-39.

632 Georg Stauth and Bryan S. Turner, "Ludwig Klages (1872-1956) and the Origins of Critical Theory," *Theory, Culture & Society*, Vol. 9, 1992, pp. 45-63.

633 Nitzan Lebovic, "The Beauty and Terror of *Lebensphilosophie*: Ludwig Klages, Walter Benjamin, and Alfred Baeumler," *South Central Review*, Vol. 23, No. 1, Spring 2006, pp. 23-39.

634 See Gershom Scholem, *Walter Benjamin: The Story of a Friendship* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1981), pp. 19-20.

635 And yet, as an indicator of the messiness of these ideas, debates, and the difficulty of drawing conclusions, making observations, and avoiding sweeping and unfair generalizations, see, for instance, Theodor Adorno's critique of occultism as "the metaphysic of the dopes," cited in this larger discussion of Adorno: Cary J. Nederman and James Wray Goulding, "Popular Occultism and Critical Theory: Exploring Some Themes in Adorno's Critique of Astrology and the Occult," *Sociological Analysis*, Vol. 42, No. 4, Winter 1981, pp. 325-32. Moreover, entire books with titles like *Freud, Jung, and Occultism* have been done (by author Nandor Fodor, published in 1971). These subjects are a black hole that can suck the researcher into a vortex with no end in sight, and into an intellectual tailspin not worthy of any individual's time and energies. It is intellectual trash—dead ideas that not surprisingly long ago earned their death.

636 On Benjamin specifically, see Josephson-Storm, *The Myth of Disenchantment*, pp. 226-36.

637 Josephson-Storm, *The Myth of Disenchantment*, p. 215.

638 Josephson-Storm, *The Myth of Disenchantment*, p. 239.

639 See Paul Kengor, "The Hillary-Alinsky-Lucifer Connection," *The American Spectator*, July 26, 2016.

640 David Emery, "Did Saul Alinsky Dedicate 'Rules for Radicals' to Lucifer?" *Snopes.com*, July 20, 2016, posted at <https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/saul-alinsky-dedicated-rules-for-radicals-to-lucifer/>.

641 Diane Vera, "Saul D. Alinsky: A role model for left-wing Satanists," *Theistic Satanism*, 2005, posted at <http://www.theisticsatanism.com/politics/Alinsky.html>.

642 Angie Drobnic Holan, "What Ben Carson said about Hillary Clinton, Saul Alinsky and Lucifer," *PolitiFact*, July 20, 2016, posted at <https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/article/2016/jul/20/what-ben-carson-said-about-hillary-clinton-saul-al/>.

643 Stanley Kurtz, "Why Hillary's Alinsky Letters Matter," *National Review Online*, September 22, 2014.

644 Alinsky said this in his 1972 interview with *Playboy* magazine. It is known as "The Interview with Saul Alinsky, Part Ten," and available on many admiring progressive websites.

645 See "The Liberation of Kate Millett," *Time* magazine, August 31, 1970; and Lily Rothman, "Obituary: Kate Millett," *Time* magazine, September 14, 2017.

- 646 Barbara Hardy, “De Beauvoir, Lessing—Now Kate Millett,” *The New York Times*, September 6, 1970.
- 647 Mallory Millett, “Marxist Feminism’s Ruined Lives,” FrontPageMagazine. com, September 1, 2014. <https://www.frontpagemag.com/fpm/240037/marxist-feminisms-ruined-lives-mallory-millett>.
- 648 Mallory Millett, “Marxist Feminism’s Ruined Lives.”
- 649 See http://www.glbtc.com/literature/millett_k.html, retrieved December 12, 2014.
- 650 Email correspondence with Mallory Millett, November 27, 2017.
- 651 Email correspondence with Mallory Millett, November 27, 2017.
- 652 Phone conversation with Mallory Millett, February 2, 2019.
- 653 Mallory Millett, “Marxist Feminism’s Ruined Lives,” FrontPageMagazine. com, September 1, 2014. <https://www.frontpagemag.com/fpm/240037/marxist-feminisms-ruined-lives-mallory-millett>
- 654 Mark Tapson, “My Sister Kate: The Destructive Feminist Legacy of Kate Millett,” FrontPageMagazine.com, February 7, 2018. <https://www.front-pagemag.com/fpm/269251/my-sister-kate-destructive-feminist-legacy-kate-mark-tapson>
- 655 “Millett: No Gun Ever Killed Anyone,” TruthRevolt.org, June 2, 2014, posted at <https://www.truthrevolt.org/commentary/millett-no-gun-ever-killed-anyone>.
- 656 Carrie Gress, *The Anti-Mary Exposed: Rescuing the Culture from Toxic Femininity* (Charlotte, NC: TAN Books, 2019), p. 75.
- 657 Gress, *The Anti-Mary Exposed*, pp. 73-74, 76.
- 658 Email correspondence with Mallory Millett, November 22, 2017.
- 659 Penelope Green, “Feminism’s A-List Attends Kate Millett’s Memorial in New York,” *The New York Times*, November 10, 2017.
- 660 “Obama Rallies Columbia, Missouri,” RealClearPolitics, October 30, 2008, posted at https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2008/10/obama_rallies_columbia_missour.html.
- 661 See earlier citation.
- 662 See Paul Kengor, “Fundamental Transformation: The 2010s, the LGBTQ Decade,” *National Catholic Register*, January 2020.
- 663 “FACT SHEET: Obama Administration’s Record and the LGBT Community,” White House Press Office, June 9, 2016, posted at <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/06/09/fact-sheet-obama-administrations-record-and-lgbt-community>; and “FACT SHEET: Promoting and Protecting the Human Rights of LGBT Persons,” White House Press Office, June 29, 2016, posted at <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/06/29/fact-sheet-promoting-and-protecting-human-rights-lgbt-persons>.
- 664 See earlier citations regarding the New York City Council and the BBC. For Facebook and the 51, 53, 56, 58, 71 “gender options,” see pieces at the *Daily Beast*, *Huffington Post*, *Slate*, ABC News, and the *London Telegraph*, posted at <https://www.thedailybeast.com/what-each-of-facebooks-51-new-gender-options-means>; https://www.huffpost.com/entry/facebooks-gender-identities_b_4811147; <https://slate.com/technology/2014/02/facebook-custom-gender-options-here-are-all-56-custom-options.html>; <https://abcnews.go.com/blogs/headlines/2014/02/heres-a-list-of-58-gender-options-for-facebook-users/>; and <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/facebook/10930654/Facebooks-71-gender-options-come-to-UK-users.html>.
- 665 I have addressed many times in books and articles and commentaries the question and degree of Barack Obama’s sympathy for socialism, communism, Marxism. I deal with it at length in my book on Obama’s mentor, *The Communist: The Untold Story of Frank Marshall Davis, Barack Obama’s Mentor* (NY: Mercury Ink / Simon & Schuster, 2012), where I quote at length communists who knew Obama in college, including the president of Occidental College’s

Marxist organization at the time. I believe there is no question that Obama was a communist in college; in fact, prior to arriving at college. By the time of his presidency, I believe he was more of a general leftist, albeit a radical leftist in certain respects, particularly on cultural issues. He is symptomatic of where many Marxists have drifted, namely, to culture. The source I interviewed for *The Communist*, Dr. John Drew, still discerned in President Obama much of the “Marxist mental architecture” and mindset he had seen from Obama in college, including on some class and economic issues. Drew, for the record, was a cultural Marxist, a big fan of Herbert Marcuse and other Frankfurt School writers. See Kengor, *The Communist*, pp. 249-62.

666 As cited earlier, see Marx’s September 1843 letter to Arnold Ruge, posted at https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/letters/43_09-alt.htm and https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/letters/43_09.htm.

667 “Seems” is the operative word. The word “abolition” or “abolish” does not appear on every page, but at times it certainly seems so, given how frequent and striking is such language from Marx.

668 Payne, *Marx: A Biography*, p. 173.

669 The Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League took place in Moscow from October 2-10, 1920 and was attended by an estimated six hundred delegates. Lenin addressed the first session the evening of October 2. The transcript was published in *Pravda* on October 5, 6, and 7, 1920. It also appears in Lenin’s *Collected Works*, volume 31. See posting at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/oct/02.htm>.

670 Michelle Kern, “The capitalist culture of male supremacy and misogyny,” *People’s World*, March 25, 2018, posted at <http://www.cpusa.org/article/the-capitalist-culture-of-male-supremacy-and-misogyny/>.

671 The definitive English translation of Gramsci’s work is Joseph Buttigieg’s (father of Pete Buttigieg) translation of Gramsci’s vast volume, *Prison Notebooks (Quaderni del carcere)*, published by Columbia University Press in 1992.

672 Samuel Gregg, “The Most Dangerous Socialist in History,” *The Stream*, July 25, 2016.

673 There is debate over who first used the phrase “long march through the institutions” to describe Gramsci’s goal and strategy. Most current online sources credit a West German (naturally) Marxist writer and student activist of the 1960s named Rudi Dutschke.

674 Of Gramsci’s thirty-three notebooks, Notebooks sixteen and twenty-six deal with “Cultural Topics” I and II, respectively. Even then, cultural is a consistent theme throughout the *Prison Notebooks*.

675 Michael Walsh, *The Devil’s Pleasure Palace: The Cult of Critical Theory and the Subversion of the West* (NY: Encounter Books, 2017).

676 On the Proletariat as the victim and redeemer group in Marxist theory, see Professor Martin Malia’s introduction to the Penguin-Signet Classics edition (1998 and 2011 editions) of the *Communist Manifesto*, pp. 14-15.

677 See Paul Kengor, “Women’s Marchers, Unite!” *The American Spectator*, January 24, 2017.

678 See “About People’s World,” posted at <https://www.peoplesworld.org/about-the-peoples-world/>.

679 See discussion by Joseph Pearce, “How the Modernists Made ‘Ecumenical’ a Dirty Word,” *Crisis Magazine*, November 26, 2019.

680 See Wilfred McClay, ed., *Russell Kirk’s Concise Guide to Conservatism* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2019), pp. 2-6.

681 We have all seen the numerous polls of Millennials saying positive things about communism and even saying that they prefer communism and socialism over capitalism. In retrospect, a turning point came in 2011, when a major study by Pew Research Center found that 49 percent of Americans aged eighteen to twenty-nine have a positive view of socialism, exceeding the 43

percent with a positive view of capitalism. Three years later, in 2014, a survey by *Reason Magazine* and the Rupe Foundation did a deeper dive. It found that 53 percent of those aged eighteen to twenty-nine view socialism favorably. Not long after that survey, Gallup turned up a gem, learning that 69 percent of Millennials said they would be willing to vote for a socialist as president of the United States of America—a country founded on the antithesis of socialist principles. They did just that in 2016, contributing mightily to Bernie Sanders’s twelve million votes in the Democratic Primary. That is the data in the country that won the Cold War and defeated communism. As I write, the latest survey by Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation (conducted by YouGov), released in November 2019, shows that 36% of Millennials say they approve of communism, and 22% believe “society would be better if all private property was abolished.”

682 “Homily of his Eminence Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, Dean of the College of Cardinal,”
Vatican Basilica, April 18, 2005, posted at http://www.vatican.va/gpII/documents/homily-pro-eligendo-pontifice_20050418_en.html.

683 Fulton Sheen, “How To Think,” *Life Is Worth Living*, originally broadcast in 1955,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FmMBLTz6Pp8>.

684 Fulton Sheen, “How To Think,” *Life Is Worth Living*, originally broadcast in 1955,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FmMBLTz6Pp8>. See minute markers 19:29-23:12.

685 Fulton J. Sheen, *War and Guilt* (Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, 1941), pp. 138-39.

686 Reeves, *America’s Bishop*, p. 54.

INDEX

“10 Commandments of Communism, The,” 228

60 Andrassy Street, 125, 397

“A Compilation of Public Records of 658 Clergymen and Laymen connected With the National Council of Churches” (“658/NCC”), 165, 166, 301

“A Compilation of Public Records, 20.5%, 1411 Protestant Episcopal Rectors (as of 1955)” (“20.5%/Episcopal”), 166

“A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right,” 56

AA-1025: *The Memoirs of an Anti-Apostle*, 307, 308

Abortion, 367, 373

Adorno, Theodor, 347, 354, 360

Africa, xvii, xviii, 127

Agotha, Andrea, 312

Ali Agca, Mehmet, 304

Alinsky, Saul, 19, 322, 356, 360-364

Allen, James S. (Auerbach, Sol), 249

Allen, Richard V., 305

Almanacs, The, 338

Alsop, Joseph, 327

America magazine, 112, 186

America’s Young Communist League, 223, 239, 242, 384

American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), 166-7, 170, 211, 243

American Communist Party, 149, 150, 172, 179, 181, 211, 225, 236, 279, 364

American Federation of Teachers, 281

American Irish Progressives, 196-197

American League Against War and Fascism, 208, 211, 240, 245-246, 262-268, 338

American League for Peace and Democracy, 240, 245

American Peace Mobilization, 168-9, 280, 281

American People’s Mobilization, 169, 281

American Spectator, The, 397

American Youth Congress, 239, 240, 245

Andropov, Yuri, 304-305

Angelus Novus, 355-356

Appendix IX, [281](#)
 Aptheker, Bettina, [323](#)
 Aptheker, Herbert, [323](#)
 Aquinas, St. Thomas, [283](#)
 Arch Diocesan Union, [191-192](#)
Archives of Atheism, [14](#), [54](#)
 Aristotle, [33](#), [91](#), [117](#)
Athenaeum, [38](#), [41](#)
 Augustine, Saint, [5](#), [58](#), [283](#)
 Aveling, Edward, [92-93](#), [110](#)

Bakunin, Mikhail (Michael), [17-23](#), [25](#), [322](#), [356](#), [357](#), [360](#), [396](#)
 Baldwin, Roger, [166-167](#), [170](#)
 Ball, Hugo, [355](#)
 Ball, Rev. Lee H., [243](#)
Bankruptcy of Christian Supernaturalism, [253](#)
 Baranyk, Severian, [127](#)
 Barbusse, Henri, [266-267](#)
 Barmen, Germany, [96](#)
 Barron, John, [341](#)
 Bauer, Dr. Bruno, [12](#), [13-15](#), [23](#), [54](#), [87-89](#), [360](#), [396](#)
 Benjamin, Walter, [322](#), [347](#), [348](#), [353-357](#), [359](#), [371](#), [388](#), [396](#)
 Beria, Lavrenti, [xvi](#), [xxiv](#), [304](#)
 Berlin Wall, [ix](#), [xi](#), [xvi](#), [xix](#), [302](#), [303](#), [315](#), [390](#)
 Besant, Annie, [323](#)
 Billington, James, [122](#)
Black Book of Communism, The, [xvi](#), [xvii](#), [130](#)
 Black masses, [xx](#), [132](#), [133](#)
 Blair, Tony, [150](#)
 Blaj, Romania, [315](#)
Blessed Virgin Chastises the Infant Jesus Before Three Witnesses, The, [355](#)
 Bolshevik(s), [xviii](#), [8](#), [11](#), [107](#), [110](#), [114](#), [117](#), [119-123](#), [148](#), [149](#), [179](#), [180](#), [219](#), [233](#), [237](#), [241](#), [310](#),
 [311](#), [313](#), [328](#), [350](#), [385](#)
Book of Verse, A, [55](#)
 Bowie, Walter Russell, [166](#)
 Bammertz, Eugen, [306](#)
 Braw, Elizabeth, [302-303](#)
 Brecht, Bertolt, [353](#)
 Breindel, Eric, [185](#), [186](#), [191](#)
 Bremen, Germany, [96](#)
 Brezhnev, Leonid, [124](#)
 British Labour Party, [150](#)
 Browder, Earl, [xxiii](#), [xix](#), [167](#), [169](#), [179-182](#), [185-186](#), [197](#), [200](#), [202-210](#), [213-214](#), [216](#), [224](#), [254-257](#), [260-261](#), [264](#), [269](#), [293](#), [322](#), [399](#)
 Brussels, Belgium, [78](#), [79](#), [81](#), [136](#), [149](#)
 Buddhists, [xxiv](#), [125](#), [127](#), [287](#)

Budenz, Louis, [163](#), [169](#), [185](#), [186](#), [206](#), [219-224](#), [225](#), [226](#), [249](#), [293](#), [296](#), [399](#)
Bukharin, Nikolai, [107](#), [110](#), [148](#), [229](#)
Burns, Mary, [71](#)
Byrne, Martha, [194](#)

C.I.O. and A.F. of L., [199](#), [200](#), [295](#)
Callahan, William M., [210](#)
Cambodia, [xvi](#), [xvii](#), [xviii](#), [127](#), [173](#), [198](#), [274](#), [287](#)
Camp 22, [xvi](#)
Capacity of Today's Jews and Christians to Become Free, The, [88](#)
"Capitalist Culture of Male Supremacy and Misogyny, The" [387](#)
Carré, Marie, [307](#)
Carthage College, [35](#)
Casaroli, Archbishop Agostino, [304-305](#), [309](#)
Casey, Blessed Solanus, [297-300](#)
Castro, Fidel, [xxii](#), [86](#), [91](#), [127](#), [148](#), [173](#)
Catechism of the Catholic Church, [201](#)
Cathedral of Christ the Savior, [121](#)
"Catholic Case for Communism, The" [x](#), [112](#), [186](#)
Catholic Church, [xxii](#), [xxiii](#), [xxiv](#), [3](#), [76](#), [136](#), [138](#), [139](#), [143](#), [145](#), [147](#), [152](#), [155](#), [163](#), [181](#), [187](#), [188](#),
[192](#), [193](#), [197](#), [201](#), [205](#), [214](#), [219](#), [220-222](#), [226](#), [251](#), [254](#), [268](#), [277](#), [281](#), [286](#), [288](#), [289](#), [294](#), [297](#),
[301](#), [303](#), [311](#), [312](#), [315](#), [316](#), [325](#), [336](#), [366](#), [399](#)
Catholic University of America, [206](#), [282](#), [293](#)
Catholic Worker, [208-210](#)
Ceauesescu, Nicolai, [xvi](#), [103](#), [316](#)
Centesimus Annus, [156](#)
Chambers, Whittaker, [26](#), [118](#), [277](#), [279](#), [280](#), [285](#), [339](#), [357](#)
Chaunt, Peter, [252](#)
Cheka, [114](#), [176](#), [279](#)
Cheron, Jane, [329](#)
Chesler, Phyllis, [375](#), [376](#)
Chesterton, G.K., [394](#), [399](#), [400](#)
China, xxxxx?, [xvi](#), [xvii](#), [xviii](#), [125](#), [127](#), [163](#), [173](#), [235-238](#), [274](#), [366](#), [373](#)
"Christian Communists," [182](#)
Christian Epic, A, [98](#)
Christian Front, [210](#)
Christmas (or Nikola), [75](#), [114](#), [125](#), [132](#), [217](#), [282](#), [316](#), [329](#), [338](#)
Christophers, The, [283](#)
"Church and the Workers, The" [258](#)
Church of Satan, [356-357](#)
Church of the Archangel Michael (Moscow), [120-121](#)
Church, Communism and Democracy, The, [146](#), [296](#)
Churchill, Winston, [xi](#)
Churton, Tobias, [324](#)
Cianfarra, Camille, [228](#), [229](#), [31-311](#)
Ciszek, Walter, [127](#)

City of God, [283](#)
Clardy, Congressman Kit, [251](#), [275](#), [276](#)
Clinton, Hillary, [360](#), [375](#)
Cohn, Roy, [340](#)
Cold War, [ix](#), [xi](#), [xviii](#), [198](#), [285](#), [304](#), [305](#), [341](#), [396](#)
Columbia Teachers College, [278](#)
Columbia University, [74](#), [213](#), [215](#), [244](#), [277](#), [278](#), [292](#), [365](#), [367](#)
Cominform, [279](#)
Comment on James Mill, [55](#)
Communism and Christianity, [253](#)
Communism and Religion, [296](#)
Communism and the Conscience of West, [146](#)
Communism Answers Questions of a Communist, [206](#), [296](#)
Communism in the United States, [180](#), [214](#)
Communist Confession of Faith, [4](#)
Communist International (Comintern), [xiii](#), [xxiv](#), [113](#), [150](#), [165](#), [167](#), [176-179](#), [194](#), [198](#), [199](#), [202](#), [208](#), [214](#), [221](#), [223-225](#), [230](#), [233](#), [235-239](#), [244](#), [247](#), [249](#), [255-257](#), [266](#), [279](#), [286](#), [291](#), [293](#), [347](#), [350](#)
Communist League, [6](#), [56](#), [77](#), [89](#)
Communist League, The, [56](#)
Communist Manifesto, [xix](#), [xxi](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [26](#), [28](#), [38](#), [48](#), [56](#), [72](#), [78](#), [101](#), [102](#), [107](#), [136](#), [201](#), [204](#), [322](#), [384](#)
Communist Party Central Committee Plenum, [185](#)
Communist Party of France, [197](#), [199](#), [266](#), [286](#), [287](#)
Communist Party USA (CPUSA), [xiii](#), [xxiii](#), [xxiv](#), [128](#), [163-170](#), [179](#), [180](#), [185](#), [186](#), [189](#), [192](#), [194](#), [196](#), [197](#), [198](#), [200](#), [203](#), [210](#), [211](#), [213](#), [215](#), [220](#), [221](#), [224](#), [225](#), [238](#), [244](#), [249](#), [257](#), [259](#), [266](#), [269](#), [279](#), [281](#), [291](#), [292](#), [293](#), [298](#), [301](#), [323](#), [339-342](#), [386](#), [387](#), [391](#)
“Communist Program, The,” [229](#)
Comrade H.G., [217](#)
“Confidential report on work in religious and non-religious Catholic organizations,” [186](#), [188](#)
Congregational, [92](#), [233](#)
Congress of Vienna, [4](#), [119](#)
Conquest, Robert, [xviii](#)
Constantine, [58](#)
Contemporary Publishing Association, [58](#)
Cornell University, [231](#), [233](#)
Coughlin, Fr. Charles, [298](#), [299](#)
Counts, Dr. George, [278](#)
Courtois, Stephane, [xvi](#), [130](#)
Critical Theory, [357-360](#), [389](#), [392](#), [395](#)
Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels, [13](#)
Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, [55](#)
Crosby, Michael H. (OFM Cap.), [298](#), [299](#)
Crowley, Aleister, [322](#), [324-331](#), [335](#), [337](#), [396](#), [403](#)
Crusades, [62](#)
Cuba, [xviii](#), [86](#), [125](#), [127](#), [173](#)
Cultural Marxism, [347](#), [350](#), [358](#), [376](#), [387](#), [389](#), [390](#), [392](#)

Czar Alexander, [4](#), [119](#)

Dada (Dadaist movement), [355](#)

Daily Worker, [128](#), [166](#), [167](#), [206](#), [211](#), [214](#), [216](#), [217](#), [220](#), [223](#), [225](#), [291](#), [391](#)

Dalai Lama, [127](#)

Dante, [34](#), [37](#), [130](#)

Darkness at Noon, [108](#)

Darwin, Charles, [92](#), [118](#)

Das Kapital, [73](#), [79](#)

Davis, Angela, [83](#), [390](#), [391](#)

Davis, Jerome, [231](#), [232](#), [233](#)

Day, Dorothy, [208](#), [209](#), [210](#)

Debs, Eugene, [212](#)

“Decay of Religious Authority, The,” [61](#)

Declaration of Independence, [178](#)

Decree Against Communism, [139](#), [142](#)

Democratic Party, [186](#), [200](#)

Democratic socialism, [149](#)

Department XX/4, [303](#)

Deus Caritas Est, [158](#)

Deutsch-Französische Jahrbucher, [87](#)

Deverall, Richard L. G., [210](#)

Devil’s Mill, The, [131](#),

Dewey, John, [xiii](#), [215](#), [278](#)

Dictatorship of the Proletariat, [7](#), [148](#), [151](#)

Dies, Congressman Martin, [167-168](#)

Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature, The, [56](#)

Dimitrov, Georgi, [206-208](#), [255-8](#)

Dirksen, Everett, [287](#)

Dissemond, Monsignor Paul, [304](#)

Diuturnum, [153](#)

Divine Comedy, The, [37](#)

Divini Redemptoris, [138-139](#), [217](#)

Doctors’ Club, [29](#), [54](#)

Dodd, Bella, [163](#), [165](#), [169](#), [275-291](#), [293](#), [295-297](#), [299](#), [301](#), [322](#), [399](#)

Dodd, Thomas, [287](#)

Dominicans, [287](#), [299](#)

Dupes: How America’s Adversaries Have Manipulated Progressives for a Century, [164](#), [165](#), [168](#)

Duranty, Walter, [322](#), [327-330](#), [403](#)

Dzershinsky, Felix, [304](#)

Eastern Rite Catholic Church, [315](#), [316](#)

Eastland, James, [287](#)

Eddy, Dr. Sherwood, [231](#), [233](#)

Edwards, Dr. Lee, [xviii](#)

“*Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon, The*,” [xi](#), [48](#)

Ellis, Havelock, [92](#)
Emmanuel, [44](#), [45](#)
Engels, Friedrich, [xx](#), [xxii](#), [3-4](#), [6-9](#), [14](#), [17](#), [23](#), [27](#), [55](#), [56](#), [70-74](#), [79](#), [81-86](#), [89-92](#), [95-103](#), [107](#), [110](#),
[111](#), [137](#), [151](#), [181](#), [198](#), [201](#), [202](#), [204](#), [257](#), [321](#), [322](#), [324](#), [329](#), [337](#), [339](#), [371](#), [380](#), [391](#)
Epicurus, [60](#)
Episcopal Church, [164](#), [166](#), [195](#), [225](#), [232](#), [259](#)
Epstein, Jason, [361](#)
Essence of Christianity, The, [14](#)
Ethiopia, [xviii](#)
Eucharistic League, The, [192-193](#)
Evans, Arthur, [334](#)
EWTN, [145](#), [289](#)

Fascism, [187](#), [199](#), [203](#), [206-208](#), [238](#), [239](#), [262](#), [267](#)
Faust (ian), [xx](#), [16](#), [17](#), [36](#), [40](#), [48](#), [57](#), [77](#), [98](#), [100](#), [383](#)
Feuerbach, Ludwig, [12](#), [14](#), [55](#)
Fifth Directorate, [304](#)
Fight, [245](#), [262](#)
First Internationale, [18](#)
Fish Committee, [172](#)
Fish, Congressman Hamilton, [171-179](#)
“Five Year Plan of Atheism,” [123](#)
Fletcher, Joseph F., [166](#)
Florescu, [128-129](#)
Flynn, Elizabeth, [223](#)
Fordham University, [220](#), [279](#), [285](#), [289](#)
Forsyth, Margaret, [243](#)
Foster, William Z., [149](#), [163](#), [164](#), [169-179](#), [205](#), [224](#), [260](#), [263](#), [280](#), [322](#), [399](#)
Franciscans, [195](#), [201](#), [202](#)
Frankfurt School, [36](#), [321](#), [322](#), [343](#), [345-348](#), [353-354](#), [357](#), [358](#), [359](#), [366](#), [387](#), [388](#), [389](#), [395](#)
Freddy (Henry Frederick), [82-3](#), [92](#)
French People’s Front, [198](#)
Freud, Sigmund, [346](#), [347](#), [350](#), [352](#)
Freudo(Freudian)-Marxism, [346](#), [351](#), [358](#), [387](#), [395](#), [396](#)
Friedan, Betty, [83](#),
Fritchman, Rev. Steve, [339](#)
Fromm, Erich, [347](#)
FrontPage Magazine, [369](#), [371](#), [372](#), [373](#)

Gabriel, Mary, [71](#), [72](#), [80](#), [84](#), [85](#)
Garza Usabiaga, Daniel, [354](#)
Geer, Will, [337-339](#)
Geiger, H. Kent, [101](#), [103](#)
“Genocide of the Souls—The Pitesti Experiment, The,” [130](#)
German Ideology, The, [6](#), [27](#), [55](#), [56](#), [101](#), [380](#)
Gitlow, Ben, [149](#), [150](#), [163](#), [169](#), [185](#), [220](#), [224-247](#), [249](#), [251](#), [256](#), [276](#), [293](#), [399](#)

Glasnost, [315](#)
Glemp, Cardinal, [307](#)
God and the State, [18](#), [19](#), [360](#)
God's Spies: The Stasi's Cold War Espionage Operation Inside the Church, [302](#)
Godesberg, [15](#)
Goethe University, [36](#), [347](#)
Goethe, [36](#), [40](#), [48](#), [58](#), [77](#), [117](#), [118](#), [383](#)
Gorbachev, Mikhail, [xviii](#), [35](#), [108](#), [135](#), [315](#)
Gorky, Maxim, [114](#)
GPU, [279](#), [353](#)
Gramsci, Antonio, [366](#), [388](#), [389](#)
Graves de Communi Re, [153](#)
Great Terror, The, [123](#), [138](#)
Greek-Catholic Church, [316](#)
Green, Gilbert, [223](#), [224](#), [239](#)
Gregg, Samuel, [388](#), [389](#)
Gress, Carrie, [374](#)
GRU, [280](#)
Guizot, [3](#)
Gulag Archipelago, The, [118](#)
Gulag, [xvi](#), [10](#), [121](#), [135](#), [182](#), [315](#)
Guthrie, Woody, [338](#)

Habermas, Jurgen, [360](#)
Hall, Gus, [205](#)
Hall, Otto, [252](#)
Hamburg, Germany, [90](#)
Hampstead Heath, [76](#)
Hans Rockle, [76](#), [77](#), [78](#)
Harper, Georgia, [361](#)
HarperCollins, [36](#)
Hartford Theological Seminary, [231](#), [233](#)
Harvard University Press, [101](#), [130](#)
Havers, Grant, [12](#)
Hay, Anita, [339](#)
Hay, Harry, [322](#), [331-343](#), [371](#), [382](#), [396](#)
Healey, Dorothy, [340](#)
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, [12](#), [13](#), [23](#), [56](#), [89](#)
Heine, Heinrich, [89-90](#)
Heinzen, Karl, [xx](#), [15-17](#)
Hejmo, Father Konrad, [307](#)
Hell of Pitesti, The, [131](#)
Helms, Sen. Jesse, [333](#)
Heresy, [253](#)
Hess, Moses, [89](#), [96](#)
Highgate Cemetery, [91](#)

Hitler, Adolph, [88](#), [168](#), [169](#), [202](#), [206](#), [207](#), [281](#), [289](#), [348](#)
Hoffman, E. T. A., [76](#)
Hoffman, Edward, [352](#)
Holbach, [89](#)
Hollywood Film and Photo League, [338](#)
Hollywood Ten, [298](#), [339](#)
Hollywood Theatre Guild, [338](#)
Holy Alliance, [4](#), [119](#)
Holy Family, The, [55](#), [56](#)
Holy Name Society, [189](#)
Holy Sepulchre, [62](#)
Hoover, J. Edgar, [292](#)
Hopkins, Harry, [200](#)
Horkheimer, Max, [347](#), [354](#), [357](#), [360](#)
House Committee on Un-American Activities, [165](#), [168](#), [225](#), [230](#)
House of Divine Providence, [309](#)
Hughes, Langston, [170](#)
Humanum Genus, [153](#)
Hungary, [125](#), [126](#), [127](#), [323](#), [397](#)
HVA (*Hauptverwaltung Aufklaerung*), [303](#)

I Confess, [224](#)
Iliesiu, Sorin and Doru Lucian, [130](#)
Inferno, The, [34](#), [37](#), [130](#)
Institute for Social Research, [347](#)
International Publishers, [279](#)
Introduction to Critique of Philosophy of Right, [55](#)
Ives, Burl, [338](#)
Izvestia, [206](#)

Jacobin(s), [11](#), [58](#)
Jerome, V.J., [222](#)
Jesuit(s), [x](#), [112](#), [296](#), [297](#), [318](#)
Jewish Question, The, [55](#), [56](#), [87](#), [89](#)
John Dewey Society, [278](#)
Johnson, Manning, [163](#), [167](#), [169](#), [185](#), [249-276](#), [286](#), [293](#), [399](#)
Johnson, Paul, [35](#), [36](#), [37](#), [44](#), [73](#), [79](#), [83](#), [84](#)
Josephson-Storm, Jason, [358-360](#)
“Judas goat,” [191](#)
Jung, Georg, [14](#), [29](#)
Just War theory, [62](#)

Kachur, Lewis, [355](#)
Kahl, Regina, [335-336](#)
Karp, Lila, [366](#)
Keir, Sophie, [375](#), [376](#)

Kennan, George F., [109](#)
KGB, [176](#), [304](#), [305](#), [313](#), [314](#), [315](#), [317](#), [318](#), [341](#)
KGB: The Secret Work of Soviet Secret Agents, [341](#)
Khmer Rouge, [198](#)
Khrushchev, Nikita, [124](#)
Kim(s), [103](#), [148](#), [173](#)
Kirichenko, Aleksey, [318](#)
Kirk, Russell, [394](#)
Klages, Ludwig, [359-360](#)
Klee, Paul, [355](#)
Knights of Columbus, [195](#)
Koehler, John, [303-305](#), [306](#)
Koestler, Arthur, [x](#), [108](#)
Kollontai, Alexandra, [83](#)
Komsomol, [228](#), [229](#)
Kovalyk, Zenobius, [127](#)
Kremlin, [109](#), [121](#), [126](#), [135](#), [169](#), [199](#), [200](#), [214](#), [227](#), [228](#), [249](#), [250](#), [258](#), [269](#), [280](#), [281](#), [296](#), [297](#),
[304](#), [305](#), [306](#), [311](#), [312](#), [317](#), [327](#), [328](#), [331](#), [341](#), [342](#), [391](#)
Kreuznach, Germany, [74](#)
Kultursmog, [397](#)
Kunzig, Robert, [227](#), [229](#), [231](#), [233-236](#), [238-241](#), [243-247](#), [251-253](#), [255-256](#), [261](#), [262-266](#), [269](#),
[275](#), [276](#)
Kurtz, Stanley, [363-364](#)

La Cabana, [xvi](#)
La Repubblica, [x](#)
Ladd, D.M., [292](#),
Lafargue, Paul, [86](#), [90-91](#), [93](#)
Lamont, Corliss, [215](#)
Laogai, [xvi](#)
Lassalle, Ferdinand, [86-87](#)
LATA '79, [306](#)
Latsis, Martin, [176](#)
Law of Thelema, [325](#)
Lawson, Elizabeth, [249](#)
Lawson, John Howard, [339](#)
Le Populaire, [199](#), [286](#)
League of the Militant Godless, [117](#), [123](#), [216](#)
Lebovic, Nitzan, [359](#)
Leininger, Johnine, [286-289](#)
Lenchen (Helene Demuth), [81-82](#), [102](#), [327](#)
Lenin, Vladimir, [xix](#), [xxii](#), [xxiii](#), [7](#), [8](#), [10](#), [11](#), [33](#), [91](#), [94](#), [103](#), [107-120](#), [122-124](#), [128](#), [146-151](#), [166](#),
[174](#), [176](#), [181](#), [182](#), [198](#), [199](#), [201](#), [206](#), [214](#), [216](#), [223](#), [224](#), [230](#), [233](#), [252](#), [257](#), [280](#), [310](#), [311](#), [322](#),
[338](#), [340](#), [342](#), [346](#), [356](#), [364](#), [384-386](#), [388](#), [391](#), [392](#)
Lessing, [89](#)
Letters to American Workers, [198](#)

Lewis, C. S., [37](#)
 LGBTQ (LGBTQIA+), [334](#), [340](#), [376](#), [381](#), [390](#), [391](#), [395](#)
 Liberation Theology, [317-318](#)
Libertas Praestantissimum, [153](#)
Liberty Under the Soviets, [166](#)
 Library of Congress, [186](#)
Life is Worth Living, [145](#)
 London, England, [69](#), [73](#), [76](#), [78](#), [79](#), [91](#), [92](#), [149](#), [328](#)
 Longuet, Jean, [43](#)
 Lovestone, Jay, [211](#)
 Lubyanka, [xvi](#), [304](#)
 “Lucindo,” [45](#)
 Lucretius, [60](#)
 “Ludwig Klages (1872-1956) and the Origins of Critical Theory,” [359](#)
 Lukacs, Georg, [347](#), [354](#), [360](#), [388](#)
 Lumpenproletariat, [63](#)
 Luther, Martin, [60-61](#), [302](#)
 Lutheran(s), [12](#), [59](#), [60](#), [62](#), [88](#), [127](#), [302](#)
 Lyons, Eugene, [327-328](#)

Malia, Dr. Martin, [xvii-xviii](#)
 Maltsev, Yuri, [35](#)
 “Man in Moscow,” [327](#), [329](#)
 Manchester, England, [96](#)
 Mann, W. Edward, [352](#)
 Manning, Chelsea, [391](#)
 Manuilsky, Dmitri, [199](#), [214](#)
 Mao Zedong, [xviii](#), [xxii](#), [91](#), [103](#), [148](#), [173](#), [237](#), [322](#), [365](#), [366](#), [373](#)
 Marcuse, Herbert, [347](#), [371](#), [383](#), [388](#), [391](#), [392](#), [396](#)
 Marinelli, Monsignor Luigi, [308](#)
Marx & Satan, [34](#)
 Marx, (von Westphalen), Jenny (wife), [37](#), [38](#), [43](#), [66](#), [74-75](#), [78-81](#), [82](#), [84](#), [89](#), [91](#), [92](#), [384](#)
 Marx, Cerf (brother of Heinrich), [59](#)
 Marx, Edgar (son), [80](#)
 Marx, Eleanor (daughter), [76](#), [83](#), [84](#), [92-93](#)
 Marx, Heinrich (father), [57](#), [59-60](#), [64-67](#)
 Marx, Heinrich Guido (son), [79](#)
 Marx, Henrietta (mother), [59](#), [67](#), [80](#)
 Marx, Jenny (daughter), [84](#), [85](#)
 Marx, Laura (daughter), [43](#), [76](#), [78](#), [85](#), [86](#), [90](#), [93](#), [94](#), [97](#)
Marx: A Biography, [36](#)
 Marx-Engels Institute, [43](#)
Masses & Mainstream, [166](#)
 Mattachine Society, [332](#)
 Matthews, J. B., [xxiii](#), [xxiv](#), [165-166](#), [210-217](#), [301](#)
 Mazlish, Bruce, [35](#)

McCarthy, Senator Joseph, [167](#), [298](#), [299](#), [340](#)
 McCarthyism, [298](#)
 McGrath, Congressman Christopher, [281](#), [282](#)
 McLellan, David, [59](#), [82](#)
 McMichael, Rev. Jack R., [242-245](#)
 Mehring, Franz, [43](#), [96](#), [97](#), [98](#)
 Melish, Rev. John Howard, [166](#)
 Menshaviks, [149](#)
 Mephistopheles, [xx](#), [16](#), [17](#), [36](#), [40](#), [41](#), [48](#), [77](#)
 Merton, Thomas, [277](#)
Message to Catholics, A, [198](#), [200](#)
 Methodist Federation for Social Action, [225](#), [226](#), [237](#), [240-246](#), [275](#)
 Methodist(s), [127](#), [164](#), [166](#), [195](#), [210](#), [217](#), [225](#), [226](#), [237](#), [240-244](#)
 Milk, Harvey, [376](#)
Millenari, the, [308-310](#)
 Millennials, [xix](#), [346](#), [396](#)
 Millett, Kate, [83](#), [351](#), [365-376](#), [396](#)
 Millett, Mallory, [365-375](#)
 Mindszenty, Joseph Cardinal, [125-127](#), [309](#), [397](#)
 Minor, Robert, [249](#)
 Moaddedi clan, [127](#)
 Modernism, [393-394](#), [398](#)
Monument a D.A.F. de Sade, [355](#)
 Morgan, J.P., [259](#)
 Morgan, Robin, [376](#)
 Moscow and Petrograd Church trials of 1921-22, [121](#)
 Moscow Russian Orthodox Patriarchy, [121](#)
 Muggeridge, Malcolm, [327](#)
Murder of Christ, The: The Emotional Plague of Mankind, [352](#)
 Muslim(s), [xxiv](#), [62](#), [125](#), [323](#)
 Mussolini, Benito, [202](#), [312](#), [388](#)

NAMBLA, [323](#), [332](#), [333](#)
 National Council of Churches, [166](#), [301](#)
 National Education Association, [278](#)
 National Negro Commission, [249](#)
 National Organization for Women (NOW), [365](#), [373](#)
 Nazi(s) (Nazism), [150](#), [289](#), [312](#), [326](#), [354](#), [355](#), [401](#)
 Near, Holly, [376](#)
 Neo-Marxist(s), [346](#), [347](#), [392](#)
 Neumann, Franz, [347](#)
 New Left, [349](#), [350](#), [363](#), [388](#)
New Masses, [280](#), [291](#)
New Republic, The, [170](#)
 New York Chapter of the National Catholic Alumni Federation, [205](#)
New York Times, The, [169](#), [197](#), [205](#), [228](#), [294](#), [296](#), [310](#), [327](#), [329](#), [331](#), [365](#), [375](#)

New York Tribune, [61](#), [62](#)
New York University Press, [35](#), [36](#)
Nicholas, Dr. Mary A., [186](#), [285](#), [286](#), [288](#), [290](#)
Nichols, Cicely, [361](#)
Niebuhr, Reinhold, [211](#)
“Nocturnal Love,” [41](#)
North Korea, [xvi](#), [xvii](#), [xviii](#), [125](#), [127](#), [173](#)
North, Gary, [35](#)
Nostis Et Nobiscum, [137](#), [152](#)
NYU, [278](#)

Obama, Barack, [26](#), [360](#), [379-383](#), [389](#)
Obergefell decision, [381](#)
Occidental College, [389](#)
Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler, [211](#), [213](#)
On Freedom of the Press, [55](#)
“On the Apostolate of the Laity in Environments Imbued With Materialism, Particularly Marxism,” [144](#)
“On the Care of Souls and Communism,” [143](#)
“On the Care of Souls With Regards to Christians Infected With Communism,” [141](#)
On the Concept of History, [354](#)
Ono, Yoko, [376](#)
“Opiate/opium of the masses/people, Religion is the,” [ix](#), [xx](#), [24](#), [25](#), [56](#), [61](#), [73](#), [107](#), [111](#), [113](#), [118](#), [145](#), [146](#), [173](#), [223](#), [230](#), [329](#), [352](#), [384](#)
Order of the Temple Orientis, [335](#)
Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, The, [101](#)
Ostpolitik, [305](#), [309](#), [310](#)
“Oulanem,” [17](#), [44-49](#), [77](#), [78](#)
Our Lady of Guadalupe, New York, [283](#)
Outstretched Hand, [183](#), [185](#), [186](#), [198](#), [205](#), [206](#), [208](#), [209](#), [211](#), [214](#), [216](#), [217](#), [223](#), [256](#), [257](#), [260](#), [269](#), [293](#), [296](#)
Oxford University Press, [35](#), [328](#)

Pacepa, Lt. Gen. Ion Mihai, [317-318](#)
Padover, Saul, [88](#)
Page, Dr. Kirby, [231](#)
Paine, Thomas, [361](#)
Palace of Soviets, [121](#)
“Pale Maiden, The,” [49-53](#), [362](#)
Palmer, Mitchell, [168](#)
“Party-State Disinformation Program,” [317](#)
Pascendi Dominici Gregis, [394](#)
Passion of Youth, [348](#)
Patriarch Alexej, [311-312](#)
Patriarch Tikhon, [122](#)
Paulist Press, [206](#)

Paulist, [192](#), [193](#), [194](#)
Payne, Robert, [xxi](#), [xxii](#), [35-38](#), [40-49](#), [67](#), [76-78](#), [99](#), [384](#)
Pellico, Silvio, [73](#)
People's World, [340](#), [387](#), [390](#), [391](#)
Person and Act (The Acting Person), [209](#)
"Pertini," [46](#)
Pestana, Frank, [340](#)
Phillips Andover Academy, [233](#)
Phnom Penh, [127](#)
Pitesti prison, [xvi](#), [129](#), [130-133](#), [315](#), [396](#)
Playboy, [361-362](#), [364](#)
"Player, The," [38-41](#), [45](#), [48](#), [53](#), [54](#), [56](#), [75](#)
PM, [280](#)
Pol Pot, [xvi](#), [xxii](#), [103](#), [127](#), [148](#), [173](#), [198](#)
Poland, [127](#), [207](#), [209](#), [305](#), [306](#)
Polish National Remembrance Institute, [307](#)
Political Affairs, [222](#)
Pope and a President, A, [307](#)
Pope Benedict XVI (Joseph Ratzinger), [5](#), [147-149](#), [157](#), [158-159](#), [395-400](#)
Pope Francis, [x](#), [149](#), [315](#)
Pope John Paul II (Karol Wojtyla), [147](#), [156-158](#), [209](#), [298](#), [304](#), [305-307](#), [397](#), [399](#), [404](#)
Pope John XXIII, [156](#)
Pope Leo XIII, [x](#), [78](#), [137](#), [152-157](#), [399](#)
Pope Pius IX, [x](#), [4](#), [136](#), [137](#), [152](#), [205](#), [399](#)
Pope Pius X, [394](#), [399](#), [403](#), [404](#)
Pope Pius XI, [x](#), [xxiv](#), [138](#), [156](#), [217](#), [296](#), [399](#)
Pope Pius XII (Eugenio Pacelli), [xxiv](#), [125](#), [126](#), [138](#), [139](#), [142](#), [187](#), [296](#), [311](#), [312](#), [313](#), [399](#)
Popieluszko, Fr. Jerzy, [127](#)
Poverty of Philosophy, The, [56](#)
Poverty of Philosophy, The, [56](#)
Pravda, [107](#), [206](#), [384](#)
Presbyterian, [164](#), [212](#), [213](#), [217](#), [323](#)
Presidential Commission for the Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression, [135](#)
Prince of Darkness, [xx](#), [35](#), [39](#), [40](#), [48](#), [402](#)
Princeton Theological Seminary, [233](#)
Prison Notebooks, [388](#)
Private Property and Communism, [6](#)
Progressive Christian(s), [164](#), [165](#), [201](#), [217](#)
Progressive Education Association, [278](#)
Protestant Digest, (The Protestant), [167](#), [222](#), [268](#), [269](#)
Protestant Reformation, [61](#)
Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph, [10](#)

Quadragesimo Anno, [138](#), [154](#)
Qui Pluribus, [205](#), [136-137](#), [205](#)
Quod Apostolici Muneris (On Socialism), [137](#), [152](#)

Rabbi Hillel, [361](#)
Rabiner, Susan, [361](#)
Radical Faeries, [332-336](#)
Radzinsky, Eduard, [123](#)
Rankin, Congressman, [222](#)
Rarick, Congressman John, [284](#)
Rautenstrauch, Prof. Walter, [243](#)
Ray, Man, [355](#)
Reagan, President Ronald, [ix](#), [xi](#), [xix](#), [109](#), [247](#), [305](#), [380](#)
“Real Socialism,” [157](#)
“Redirection of Communist Investigations,” [292](#)
Reeves, Thomas, [296](#)
Reich, Wilhelm, [322](#), [347](#), [348-354](#), [371](#), [383](#), [388](#), [396](#)
Rerum Novarum, [153-154](#), [156](#), [158](#)
Revolutionary Policy Committee, [211](#)
Rheinische Zeitung, [55](#)
Roberts, Donna, [354](#)
Rockefeller, Jr., John D., [359](#)
Rolland, Romain, [246-247](#)
Romania, [xvi](#), [34](#), [127](#), [128-130](#), [312](#), [315-316](#), [396](#)
Romanian blessed: Frentiu, Aftenie, Suciu, Chinezo, Balan, Rusu, and Hossu, [316](#)
Romerstein, Herbert, [164](#)
Roosevelt, Eleanor, [197](#), [200](#)
Roosevelt, President Franklin (FDR), [168](#), [187-188](#), [197](#), [200](#), [249](#), [280](#), [380](#)
Roscoe, Will, [331-332](#)
Rosenbergs, [285](#)
Rothbard, Murray, [35](#)
Rousseau, [59](#), [89](#)
Ruge, Arnold, [14](#), [27](#), [89](#), [383](#)
Rules for Radicals, [360-361](#), [363](#), [364](#)
Rummel, R. J., [xviii](#)
Rusak, Vladimir, [313-315](#)
Russian Orthodox Church, [119-122](#), [310-313](#), [315](#)
Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, [11](#), [111-113](#), [149](#)
Ryazanov, David, [43](#)

Sacra Romana Rota, [308](#)
Sacred Heart Society, [189](#)
Saint Max, [55](#)
Salon, [74](#)
Sanger, Margaret, [92](#)
Sanomonte, [309](#)
“Saul D. Alinsky: A role model for leftwing Satanists,” [362](#)
“Savage Songs,” [38](#)
Scalfari, Eugenio, [x](#)
Scarlett, Episcopal Bishop William, [166](#)

Scherer, Congressman Gordon, [251](#), [253](#), [260](#)
Scholem, Gershom, [356](#)
School of Darkness, [278](#), [281](#)
Schultz, Dr., [194-195](#)
Schwartz, Stephen, [86](#), [323](#)
Seamless Robe of Jesus (Holy Robe or Holy Coat), [58](#), [75](#)
Second Congress of the Russian
Social-Democratic Labor Party, [149](#)
“Secondary Aspects of Mass Organization,” [260](#)
Seeger, Pete, [338](#)
Seminaries, [xxii](#), [141](#), [142](#), [197](#), [267](#), [268-271](#), [274](#), [275](#), [276](#), [277](#), [284-288](#), [290-294](#), [296](#), [297](#), [300](#),
[301](#), [303](#), [309](#), [310](#), [313](#), [316](#), [317](#)
Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, [238](#)
Sexual Politics, [365](#), [367](#), [371](#), [376](#)
Sexual Revolution, The, [350](#), [352](#), [388](#)
Sharansky, Natan, [127](#)
Shaw, George Bernard, [92](#)
Sheen, Fulton (Monsignor, Bishop), [xxiv](#), [127](#), [142](#), [145-147](#), [205](#), [206-208](#), [220](#), [281-283](#), [286](#), [291](#),
[294-297](#), [299](#), [317](#), [400-401](#), [404](#)
Shelepin, Aleksandr, [317](#)
Shroud of Secrecy: The Story of Corruption Within the Vatican, (Via col vento in Vaticano), [308](#)
Simon & Schuster, [35](#)
Sister M. Bernice, [299](#)
Sixth World Congress of the Comintern, [113](#), [291](#)
Skousen, Mark, [35](#)
Smith, Marion, [7](#)
Smith, Rev. Alson J., [243](#)
Smith, Wilfred, [336](#)
“Smoke of Satan,” [xxiv](#), [143](#), [316-318](#)
Social Democrat(s), [98](#), [111](#), [112](#), [149](#), [150](#)
Socialist Party, American, [149-150](#), [169](#), [211](#), [212](#), [213](#), [226](#)
Socialist Party, French, [199](#), [286](#)
Socialist Party, World, [150](#), [151](#)
Socialist Society for Sexual Consultation and Sexual Research, [351](#)
Society for Technical Aid to Russia, [237](#)
Society for the Propagation of the Faith, [283](#)
Solzhenitsyn, Alexander, [xviii](#), [118](#), [130](#)
Sorge, Richard, [347](#)
“Sources of Soviet Conduct, The,” [109](#)
Soviet Campaign Against God, The, [138](#)
Soviet Central Committee, [108](#), [306](#)
Soviet Comintern Archives, [xxiv](#), [165](#), [167](#), [186](#)
Soviet Comintern, [xiii](#), [11](#), [150](#), [165](#), [179](#), [224](#), [230](#), [266](#), [286](#), [350](#)
Soviet Russia Today, [246-247](#)
Soviet Spirit, The, [166](#)
Spain, [187](#), [203](#), [204](#), [206](#), [296](#), [354](#)

Spanish Civil War, [296](#)
 Spanish Inquisition, [xix](#)
Spe Salvi (In Hope We Are Saved), [147](#)
 Spellman, Cardinal, [xxiv](#), [200](#), [205](#), [222](#)
 Sperber, Jonathan, [13](#), [15](#), [59](#), [63](#), [80](#), [83-84](#), [86](#), [89](#)
Spies in the Vatican: The Soviet Union's Cold War Against the Catholic Church, [303](#), [304](#)
 Spofford, William B., [232](#), [233](#)
 St. Ambrose, [58](#)
 St. Francis of Assisi Church, New York, [282](#)
 St. Helena, [58](#)
 St. Michael (Cathedral of), [78](#), [81](#), [136](#)
 St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, [145](#), [283](#)
 St. Petersburg, [127](#)
 Stalin, Joseph, [xiii](#), [xviii](#), [xix](#), [xxii](#), [7](#), [10](#), [103](#), [107](#), [109](#), [121](#), [123](#), [124](#), [127](#), [138](#), [146](#), [148](#), [149](#), [166](#),
[168](#), [169](#), [179](#), [199](#), [200](#), [201](#), [203](#), [207](#), [227](#), [228](#), [236](#), [249](#), [257](#), [266](#), [281](#), [286](#), [292](#), [298](#), [310](#), [311](#),
[312](#), [323](#), [327](#), [338](#), [342](#), [364](#), [384](#)
 Stasi, [302-304](#), [306](#)
State and Revolution, The, [151](#)
 Stauth, Georg, [359](#)
 Steffens, Lincoln, [170](#)
 Steinem, Gloria, [375](#)
 Stevens, Bennett, [258](#), [259](#)
 Strang, William, [327](#)
 Subsidiarity, [158](#), [159](#)
 Sullins, Dr. Paul, [293](#)
 Survey Graphic, [231](#)

Tactics of Communism, The, [297](#)
 Tarr, Zoltan, [345](#)
 Taylor, S.J., [328-330](#)
 Ten-Point Plan, [7-9](#), [70](#)
 Tenth National Convention of CPUSA, [261](#)
 Theses on Feuerbach, [55](#)
 Third All-Russia Congress of the Russian Young Communist League, [115](#), [384](#)
 Third International (Communist International), [177-178](#)
 Thomas, Norman, [212-213](#)
 Thorez, Maurice, [198](#)
 Thorstad, David, [332](#)
 Timmons, Stuart, [331](#), [336](#), [339](#), [340](#), [341](#), [342](#)
 Tondi, Alighiero, [296-297](#)
 Toohey, Pat, [225](#)
Tortured for Christ, [34](#), [128](#)
Toward Soviet America, [170](#), [280](#)
 Trachtenberg, Alexander, [278-279](#)
 Trade Union Women's Committee for Peace, [280](#)
 Trier, Germany, [58-59](#), [63](#), [75](#), [98](#), [99](#), [100](#)

Trinity League, The, [194-195](#)
 Trinity Western University, [12](#)
 Trotsky, Leon, [10](#), [109](#), [117-119](#), [121](#), [122](#), [123](#), [148](#), [149](#), [216](#), [229](#), [310](#), [322](#), [323](#), [332](#), [338](#)
 Troy (Trojan horse), [257-258](#)
True Socialism, [56](#)
True Socialists, The, [56](#)
 Turner, Bryan S., [359](#)
 Turner, Kathleen, [375](#)
 “Two-spirit,” [333-4](#), [382](#)
 Tyrrell Jr., R. Emmett, [397](#)

Union Theological Seminary, [xxiii](#), [180](#), [182](#), [212](#), [213](#), [244](#)
 “United Front, The: The Key to Our New Tactical Orientation,” [257](#)
 United States Congress Against War, [266](#)
 University of Berlin, [12](#), [353](#)
 University of Bonn, [13](#), [14](#), [360](#)
 University of Chicago Press, [358](#)
 University of Frankfurt, [347](#)
 University of Freiburg, [353](#)
 University of Notre Dame, [220](#)
Unknown Karl Marx, The, [36](#)
 Uphaus, Rev. Willard, [243](#)
 Urquhart, David, [62](#)
Use Value of Lucifer, The: A Comparative Analysis of the Figures of Lucifer and Satan in the Writings of Roger Caillois and Walter Benjamin in the 1930's, [354](#)
 Uva, Don Pasquale, [309](#)

Vassart, Albert, [199-200](#), [286-287](#), [295](#)
Vatican and the Kremlin, The, [228](#)
 Vatican II, [140](#), [143](#), [145](#), [293](#)
 Vatican, The, [xxiii](#), [187](#), [188](#), [205](#), [228](#), [288](#), [290](#), [294](#), [296](#), [297](#), [298](#), [304](#), [305](#), [308](#), [310](#), [316](#)
 Velychkovsky, Vasyl, [127](#)
Venona Secrets, The, [185](#), [186](#)
 Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation, [xviii](#), [7](#)
Visit, The, [65](#)
 Voltaire, [59](#), [89](#)
 Von Hildebrand, Dietrich, [285](#), [289](#)
 Von Hildebrand, Dr. Alice, [285-286](#), [289-290](#)
 Von Hoffman, Nicholas, [340](#)
 Von Metternich, Klemens, [4](#)
 Voris, Michael, [290](#)

Wage Labour & Capital, [56](#)
Wages, [56](#)
 Walsh, Michael, [389](#)
 “Walter Benjamin and His Angel,” [356](#)

Walter, Francis E., [234-235](#)
Ward, Father (Paulist priest), [192-194](#)
Ward, Rev. Dr. Harry F., [166-168](#), [204](#), [211](#), [212](#), [225-226](#), [231](#), [232](#), [235-237](#), [238](#), [240-246](#), [263](#),
[266](#), [267](#), [270](#), [275](#), [322](#), [399](#)
Weathermen, [324](#)
Webber, Rev. Charles C., [243-244](#)
Weigel, George, [307](#)
What Is Communism, [216](#), [260](#), [264](#)
Wheen, Francis, [15-17](#), [86](#)
Whole of Their Lives, The, [224](#)
Wiegand, Joachim, [303](#)
Williams, Rev. Albert Rhys, [231-233](#)
Williams, Walter, [87](#),
Wilson, President Woodrow, [168](#), [200](#)
Wisdom, [192](#), [193-194](#)
Witchcraft and the Gay Counterculture, [334](#)
Wolf, Markus, [303](#)
Wolfe, Bertram, [149-150](#)
Women's March, [391](#)
Woolley, Barry Lee, [118](#)
Working Class Against Fascism, The, [207](#)
World Congress Against War, [267](#)
World Council of Churches, [301](#), [318](#)
World Socialist Party of the United States, [150](#), [151](#)
Wright, Richard, [x](#)
Wurmbrand, Richard, [34](#), [36](#), [37](#), [44](#), [49](#), [52](#), [127](#), [128-130](#), [315](#), [397](#)
www.marxists.org, [44](#), [49](#), [54](#)
Wyszynski, Cardinal, [127](#)

Yakovlev, Alexander, [xviii](#), [119](#), [135-136](#)
Yale University Press, [135](#)
Yale, [233](#)
Yekaterinburg, [119](#)
Young Communist League of the United States, [223](#), [239](#), [242](#)
Young Hegelians, [13](#), [54](#), [96](#)
"Young Marx, The," [53](#), [55](#)

Zagorsk Theological Seminary, [313](#)
Zherzhinsky, Felix, [xvi](#)
Zinoviev, Grigori, [11](#)